

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1924.

## EURIPIDES' *ALCMAEON* AND THE *APOLLONIUS ROMANCE*.

THE genesis of the Greek prose romance is still in large part shrouded in darkness, in spite of the researches of Erwin Rohde, one of the greatest scholars of the last generation. The reasons are evident; the material at our disposal is far too scanty, the loss of early specimens of this literary form is far too great to allow of a flawless reconstruction of the history of the Greek romance. The same lacunae have also prevented us from obtaining as complete an insight into the sources of the extant romances as would be desirable. Rohde conjectured that the genre was the result of a skilful combination of mythological narrative and adventure novel;<sup>1</sup> Warren thought that the Greek prose romance had about the same origin and took the same development as the old French prose romance—that is, it developed out of the epic.<sup>2</sup> At all times scholars have been aware of the fact that the great rôle which love plays in the Greek romance has a parallel in the tragedies of Euripides,<sup>3</sup> who may be considered the first tragic poet to introduce the love theme on the stage.<sup>4</sup> But so far as I am aware, it has not been pointed out that Euripides was drawn upon for whole episodes in order to enrich the plot of the novel. Yet such seems to have been the case for one of the best-known passages of the *Apollonius Romance*,<sup>5</sup> as I shall endeavour to show in the following pages.

It will be recalled that Apollonius, after his marriage, sets out to sea, but loses his young wife after the birth of a daughter. As she is thought dead, her body, enclosed in a chest, is thrown overboard. Apollonius arrives at Tarsus and there entrusts his daughter Tharsia to a friendly couple, Stranguillio and Dionysias, while he goes again to sea. Tharsia receives a good education and grows up to be a beautiful girl. Then Dionysias grows jealous because her own daughter is extremely ugly. Accordingly, she has her taken to the beach by a slave, there to be killed. At the last minute a band of pirates land at that point of the coast, make a raid, and liberate the girl, only to take her on board their ship, and sail off with her. Dionysias, thinking her dead, has a monument erected to her. Some time later Apollonius returns to visit his

<sup>1</sup> E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> F. M. Warren, *A History of the Novel previous to the Seventeenth Century*, New York, 1895, pp. 21 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Rohde, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 sqq.

NO. II., VOL. XVIII.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> On this work cf. Hartung, *Die byzantinische Novelle*, *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, L (1872), p. 28; Rohde, p. 435; Dunlop, *History of Prose Fiction*, London, 1896, I. 82.

daughter, and is inconsolable on learning the news. He again leaves the country by ship and arrives at Mitylene, where he makes the acquaintance of a young man, Athenagoras. To console him, Athenagoras leads on board a young girl, an expert musician, whom he had found in a brothel. She is none other than Tharsia, whom the pirates had sold to the owner of the establishment. Owing to her musical talent she had succeeded in escaping the dangers of the place, and had made friends with Athenagoras. The episode ends by father and daughter recognizing each other. Finally he even recovers his wife, who had been dead only in appearance and had likewise been saved.

It is my contention that this important episode, or group of episodes, was borrowed from one of the lost tragedies of Euripides, entitled *Alcmaeon*.<sup>1</sup> Its content was fortunately summarized by Apollodorus, as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Εὐριπίδης δὲ φησιν Ἀλκμαίωνα κατὰ τὸν τῆς μανίας χρόνον ἐκ Μαντοῦς Τειρεσίου παῖδας δύο γεννῆσαι, Ἀμφίλοχον καὶ θυγατέρα Τισιφώνην, κομίσαντα δὲ εἰς Κόρινθον τὰ βρέφη δοῦναι τρέφειν Κορινθίων βασιλεῖ Κρέοντι, καὶ τὴν μὲν Τισιφώνην διενεγκοῦσαν εὐμορφίᾳ ὑπὸ τῆς Κρέοντος γυναικὸς ἀπεμποληθῆναι, δεδοικίας μὴ Κρέων αὐτὴν γαμετὴν ποιήσεται· τὸν δὲ Ἀλκμαίωνα ἀγοράσαντα ταύτην ἔχειν οὐκ εἰδὸτα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα θεραπεύειν, παραγενόμενον δὲ εἰς Κόρινθον ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν τέκνων ἀπαίτησιν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν κομίσασθαι.

The chief differences between the narrative of the romance and the tragedy of Euripides are: (1) In Euripides the father loses and recovers his daughter and his son, in the romance his daughter and his wife. (2) In Euripides the jealous wife fears that the heroine may deprive her of her husband's love, in the romance she is jealous of her adopted daughter because she is more beautiful than her own child. (3) Euripides says nothing about the pirates and the brothel; the jealous wife of the foster-father sells her directly as a slave, and the girl's own father buys her without knowing her. (4) To the royal milieu of the tragedy corresponds a more *bourgeois* one in the romance.

All these changes, especially 3 and 4, are perfectly intelligible from the standpoint of the technique peculiar to the Greek novel. Thus the interference of the pirates and the girl in the brothel would have been impossible on the classical stage; but both fitted into the romance admirably, such episodes belonging to the stock-in-trade of the late Greek romancer. The second difference is due to the influence of a widespread fairy-tale type.<sup>3</sup>

To conclude, there can be no reasonable doubt that the episode or group of episodes under discussion is a literary borrowing, and that the author of the romance drew on the *Alcmaeon* of Euripides for this part of his work, adding to the more simple plot of the tragic poet and complicating the action by new adventures which suited the taste of a late Greek public.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

FLAT RIVER, MO.,  
U.S.A.

<sup>1</sup> *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. A. Nauck<sup>3</sup>, pp. 479 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibl.* III. 7. 7.

<sup>3</sup> A. Aarne, *Verzeichnis der Märchentypen*, Helsinki, 1911, types 403A; 510A; 511.

The  
and a go  
domo, § 4

<sup>1</sup> Roman R  
<sup>2</sup> Greatness

## PVBLIVS CLODIVS AND THE ACTS OF CAESAR.

*De domo*, § 40:

'Tu tuo praecipitante iam et debilitato tribunatu auspicio-  
patronus subito exstitisti . . . ; tibi M. Bibulus quaerenti se de caelo  
seruasse respondit idemque in contione dixit, ab Appio tuo fratre pro-  
ductus, te omnino, quod contra auspicia adoptatus esses, tribunum  
non fuisse. tua denique omnis actio posterioribus mensibus fuit,  
omnia quae C. Caesar egisset, quod contra auspicia essent acta, per  
senatum rescindi oportere; quod si fieret, dicebas te tuis umeris me  
custodem urbis in urbem relaturum.'

On the strength of this passage historians have assumed that Clodius in  
58 B.C. had turned against Caesar and seriously intended to rescind his acts.

Thus Heitland<sup>1</sup> says: 'Anyhow he was no longer on terms with the  
triumvirs. He ended his year of office by a wild attack upon Caesar and his  
*Julian laws* as being illegally carried.'

Ferrero<sup>2</sup> has the same view: 'Clodius adopted the most unexpected of all  
his many devices. *He turned against his old master, Caesar, and made advances  
to the Conservatives, promising to declare Caesar's laws null and void.*'

So also Meyer says:<sup>3</sup> 'Clodius was far from considering himself a mere  
tool of the men in power; as these had used him, so he had used them for his  
own purposes. *Now that Caesar was in Gaul, Clodius had no further need to  
consider him,*' and, again, 'Clodius also attacked Caesar; he declared his laws  
invalid. . . .'

No one, however, has attempted to explain how exactly Clodius hoped to  
benefit himself by this mad-dog policy, or has, in fact, treated him as a  
reasonable being.

It is the object of this paper to suggest that *De domo*, 40 admits of a very  
different interpretation from the above; that the policy of Clodius in 59 and 58  
was in fact quite rational; that he was deliberately used by *Caesar* as a check  
upon *Pompey*, and that he consistently performed that function.

I would also lay stronger emphasis than is usual upon the fact that *Caesar*  
could not, or certainly did not, trust *Pompey* from the very inception of the  
triumvirate.

### I. THE INTERPRETATION OF *DE DOMO*, § 40.

The ordinary view—that Clodius attacked *Caesar* in 58—has probability  
and a good deal of evidence into the bargain against it. In its favour *De  
domo*, § 40 is the only piece of evidence.

<sup>1</sup> *Roman Republic*, Vol. III., pp. 173-4.

Vol. II., p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Greatness and Decline of Rome* (Eng. trans.), - <sup>3</sup> Meyer, *Caesar's Monarchie*, pp. 103 sqq.

If, accepting this view, we examine the evidence, we can only conclude that Clodius was in fact the raving madman Cicero so often called him. For if it is true to say that he attacked the laws of Caesar, it is equally true to say that 'he made a wild attack upon his own tribunate'—which as a matter of fact none of the historians has imputed to him, though Cicero with professional effrontery actually does so<sup>1</sup>—or that he suddenly championed the cause of Cicero—which he very certainly did not do. The words 'meis umeris Ciceronem custodem urbis in urbem referam' were obviously merely sarcastic.

However, Cicero does not say that Clodius 'promised to declare' or did 'declare Caesar's laws null and void,' but that he declared 'that *all* Caesar's acts, since they had been carried against the auspices, ought to be rescinded by the Senate; if *that* was done he would himself bring Cicero back from exile on his own shoulders.'

If allowance is made for the fact that Cicero, being a barrister and a politician, habitually takes his opponents' words verbatim out of their context and puts a false construction upon them,<sup>2</sup> we may conjecture that in reality Clodius's argument was as follows:

'It is said that Cicero can return because my tribunate and consequently my measures are illegal. If they are, so are *all* the acts of Caesar for precisely the same reason. Therefore if they are going to rescind mine the Senate *ought* to rescind his; if they do *that*, then certainly I'll fetch Cicero back on my own shoulders.'

Clodius knew very well he was safe in his offer and would not be called upon to undertake that arduous physical task; he probably even found pleasure in pressing his suggestion, as it placed his opponents, Pompey and the Optimates who were friendly to him, in a very awkward predicament. On the one hand they were determined to have Cicero back. On the other to rescind the acts of Caesar would be to *rescind the settlement of Pompey's veterans and the ratification of Pompey's acts*; and Clodius's logic was unanswerable.

The above involves the presumption that it was formally proposed that Cicero could return from exile as Clodius's adoption and therefore all his measures were illegal. This is rendered probable by the evidence of *De domo*, 34-39; Plutarch, *Cato Minor*, 40; and Dio Cassius, 39. 21; cf. also Greenidge, *Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, p. 361, note 5 and Heitland, Vol. III., 173-4. I suggest that it is proved positively by this passage in *De domo*, 40. Possibly such was the substance of Ninnius' motion in the Senate of June, 58.

Heitland (*ibid.*) says that Pompey felt that this 'raised the question of the validity of the acts of Clodius other than those aimed against Cicero, and therefore urged special legislation' and corresponded with Caesar. But *De domo*, 40 gives a far stronger reason than that. The acts of Caesar were involved and to them Pompey more than any living man 'inligatus tenebatur.'

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 'Videte hominis amentiam (cum) per suum tribunatum Caesaris actis inligatus tenebatur. . . .'

<sup>2</sup> He does this repeatedly in the *In Vatinius*, e.g. 41, where he plays on the meanings of this same word *oportere*.

On  
our tex  
employ  
Clodius  
answer  
in reali

W  
he left

He  
ship ha  
moreov  
his part

Po  
'Bolshe

Ca  
making  
in 87 h  
himself

(1)  
Crassus  
past and

In  
Vatinius  
Cato we  
of action

(2)  
political

to the ti  
he had  
partner,

stop any  
induced

going to  
—or to l

Pompey  
(3)  
that he l

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M  
by experie  
underrates

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *At*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *At*

## II. CAESAR'S GAME OF POLITICAL CHESS AND THE PART ASSIGNED TO CLODIVS IN IT.

On the evidence of our passage, and because of his attacks on Pompey, our textbooks agree that Clodius 'turned against his masters,' and that his employment was a mistake on Caesar's part.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, although Clodius was undoubtedly a wild reckless fellow, it would seem that he answered Caesar's special purposes very well on the whole, and that he served in reality but one master—the leader of his own Popular party.

When Caesar, *gambling on military success in Gaul*, departed from Rome, he left himself in none too strong a position on the home front.

He had won his way to power as leader of the 'Reds'; and in his consulship had still further incensed his natural enemies—the 'Die-Hards.' Success, moreover, had only been attained by inducing the reluctant Pompey to join his party.

Pompey, of course, was exceedingly uncomfortable in the rôle of 'Bolshevik,' and was always hankering after political respectability.<sup>2</sup>

Caesar, however, in 59 had imitated the methods of the Gracchi without making the mistake they had made; so now in doing what Sulla had done in 87 he strengthened himself by every possible device where Sulla had left himself weak.

(1) To counter the hatred of the 'Die-Hards' he had the alliance of Crassus and Pompey—that of the latter cemented by the immediate political past and the hatreds engendered by it,<sup>3</sup> and also by the marriage with Julia.

In addition he handed over the party machine, perfected by himself and Vatinius, into the vigorous hands of Clodius. The results were satisfactory; Cato went off to Cyprus and the Senatorial machine was kept completely out of action.<sup>4</sup>

(2) He had the ever-present fear of Pompey yielding to ambition or political instinct and making common cause with the Optimates. In addition to the ties of love and hatred with which he had attached Pompey to himself, he had protected himself by placing Crassus to keep a jealous eye on his partner,<sup>5</sup> and still further reinsured himself by giving Clodius a free hand to stop any such move. There is plenty of evidence<sup>6</sup> to show that Pompey was induced to consent to the adoption of Clodius without realizing what it was going to mean to Cicero—the most useful of men to him in the political game—or to himself. Clodius, as will be shown, carried out this task of keeping Pompey and the Optimates apart with the greatest energy.

(3) There was the personal rivalry of Pompey to be considered. It is true that he had cut a poor enough figure in 61 to 60, but the lustre of his prestige,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mommsen, 'Even Caesar had to learn by experience,' etc. On this occasion, I think, he underrates his hero's sagacity.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Att. II.* 21, 3; 22, 6, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Att. II.* 19, 2; 25, 2, etc.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *In Vat.* 35; *Pro Sest.* 15, 33, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Att. II.* 21, 41, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Pro Sest.* 15 and 4; *Att. II.* 19, 4; 20, 2; 21, 6; 22, 2, etc.

if not kept adequately dimmed, might easily gather round him a personal party (e.g. Gabinius, Hypsaëus, and the like) strong enough to upset the scale of Caesar's calculations. (It very nearly did in 57-56.) If anything were to go wrong in Gaul, what would be more likely than for Pompey to play cuckoo once again and say in effect 'You've done very well for a beginner—but things are getting serious—this is obviously a job for me!' He had done it before—to Metellus in Spain and Lucullus in the East, not to mention less important occasions.<sup>1</sup> It is possible therefore that Caesar left Rome with a whispered injunction to Clodius to 'Keep Pompey's comb cut.' Clodius at any rate carried out that task most conscientiously—in fact with more zeal than discretion; but so deep was the rift between Pompey and the Optimates that it took nearly a year for the insolences of Clodius to drive him to seek a refuge in their arms. Clodius certainly seems to have gone too far in his attacks on Pompey and in the open employment of force; in this respect he may have been a bad servant to Caesar, but not in respect of his loyalty.

(4) Finally, precautions had been taken by Caesar against his becoming himself in any way subservient to his own party machine. He had, of course, the connexions with Pompey and Crassus to rely on, and in addition he cultivated as far as was possible amicable relations with the Senate,<sup>2</sup> and in the end even allowed Cicero to come back, subject to his own assurances and the watchful eye of Clodius.

By April 56 B.C. Caesar had had sufficient time and sufficient luck; his military successes had given him such a position that he could practically dispense with the 'Red' party machine and yet meet Pompey on equal terms.

On the one hand he believed himself to be through the wood in Gaul<sup>3</sup>—though events showed that he was wrong. On the other the armed bands of Pompey and Milo had to a very large extent nullified the utility of the 'Popular party.'

When the cards were laid on the table at Lucca, Caesar felt strong enough to be able to afford to give all that Pompey could ask. Clodius could now be dropped, though it was chiefly due to him (and Crassus) that Pompey received his new powers at the hands of Caesar and not of Caesar's enemies.

This was certainly a complicated scheme of intrigue, but it was the game that every politician of the time had to play. Crassus and Caesar had played it in the sixties with precisely the same pieces as were used in the fifties—Spain, Egypt, land laws, political moves and counter moves and covering moves. Pompey had played it in 62, when he sent Metellus Nepos to attack the Senate and make an interest with Caesar and the populares, while he himself spoke Cicero and the Senate fair. He played it again in 57 and 56,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plut. *Pompey*, 31: εἰδομένον ἀλλοτρίοις νεκροῖς ὥσπερ θρόνῳ ἐπικαταλπεῖν καὶ λείψανα πολέμων σπαράσσειν.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. his attitude at the beginning of his consulship; the extension of his proconsular com-

mand by the Senate; its votes of thanksgivings for his victories; and cf. (*cum grano salis*) *In Vat.* 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Prov. cons.*, § 34: 'one more summer and Gaul will be settled.'

and so  
expone  
his hea

At  
to follo  
been sa

TH  
redoub  
of cong

TH  
Pompe

TH  
Pompe

served  
When

or at  
words

dignita  
facile p

Pe  
pressur

exile ti  
the en

the Co  
and vi

of Cae  
absurd

Pompe

he ha  
assura

superv  
contra

T  
Cicero

Pomp  
mass

<sup>1</sup> De

<sup>2</sup> Cf.

*Pompey*,

<sup>3</sup> Cf.

<sup>4</sup> Cf.

<sup>5</sup> Cf.

<sup>6</sup> In

and so did Cicero. Pompey, to change the metaphor once more, was no mean exponent of the art, but Caesar had won on points long before he knocked his heavier opponent out.

### III. HOW CLODIVS PLAYED THE PART ASSIGNED TO HIM.

At the risk of going over rather well-trodden ground it appears necessary to follow out the actions of Clodius in the years 58 to 56, to illustrate what has been said above.

The despatch of Cato to Cyprus was avowedly a move to get the most redoubtable 'Die-Hard' out of the way, and Clodius flourished familiar letters of congratulation from Caesar on doing it<sup>1</sup> [cf. II. (1)].

The attack on Cicero got rid of the man who was most likely to seduce Pompey to the Constitutional cause [cf. II. (2)].

The attack on Pompey in the affair of Tigranes,<sup>2</sup> his tampering with Pompey's acts in Galatia,<sup>3</sup> and the feud with Pompey's old friend Gabinius<sup>4</sup> served the purpose of discrediting Pompey's personal prestige [cf. II. (3)]. When the point had been scored Caesar apparently played the rôle of mediator, or at any rate was able successfully to disclaim any responsibility.<sup>5</sup> The words of Cicero to Vatinius are even more applicable to Clodius: 'Qui te suae dignitatis augendae causa *periculo tuo, nullo suo delicto ferri praecipitem est facile passus!*'<sup>6</sup>

Pompey had never wished Cicero to be attacked,<sup>7</sup> but yielded to the pressure,<sup>8</sup> and perhaps the intrigues,<sup>9</sup> of Caesar; no sooner was the orator in exile than Pompey, or his agents, began to be active on his behalf.<sup>10</sup> Towards the end of 58 these exertions matured; a *rapprochement* between Pompey and the Constitutionals was afoot, of which the recall of Cicero was an outward and visible sign.<sup>11</sup> Clodius moved heaven and earth to stop it, in the interest of Caesar, and defeated the first suggestions of his opponents by the *reductio ad absurdum* of *De domo*, 40. Caesar, however, yielded to the representations of Pompey ('*tanquam*' Cicero would be a useful man to the triumvirate, now that he had learned his lesson), and allowed Cicero to return, subject to the assurances of Q. Cicero and Pompey<sup>12</sup> and the safeguard of Clodius' hostile supervision. There is no evidence nor any probability that Clodius was acting contrary to Caesar's interests.

The year 57 showed that Clodius had been right. At the very moment of Cicero's return the price of corn suddenly went up, and it was suggested that Pompey was the only man to take control of the situation. Clodius organized mass meetings and told the mob that the rise in price was a 'put up job,'

<sup>1</sup> *De domo*, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Att.* III. 8; *Dio C.*, 38. 30; Plutarch, *Pompey*, 48.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Pro Sest.* 56.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Dio*, 38. 30; *De domo*, 124.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Att.* III. 8, 3.

<sup>6</sup> *In Vat.* 39.

<sup>7</sup> *Att.* II. 22, 2, etc.

<sup>8</sup> *Att.* X. 4, 3.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Pro Sest.* 41.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Att.* III. 8, 3 (May, 58, Hypsaenus); III. 9, 2.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Pro Sest.* 67, 68; *De domo*, 3, 4, 25.

<sup>12</sup> *Fam.* I. 9, 9 and 21.

Cicero's doing,<sup>1</sup> especially to give Pompey an important commission. The consul Lentulus,<sup>2</sup> with the assent of most of his party, moved that Pompey should be given that great commission for five years, and Cicero was called upon to support the motion in his first political speech since his return.<sup>3</sup> Even then Clodius furiously attacked the *fait accompli*,<sup>4</sup> and renewed his personal attacks on Cicero.<sup>5</sup>

The fury of his attack was redoubled later on when it transpired that Pompey was trying to get control of Egypt with the connivance, as it was suspected, of Lentulus Spinther,<sup>6</sup> Cicero, and other of his friends. At the close of the year the fact that Pompey was out to smash the triumvirate—or at any rate was thinking of doing so—was emphasized by the fact that through Lupus, one of his personal adherents, an attack was started upon Caesar's Campanian land law.<sup>7</sup> From *Q. Fr.* ii. 3 we see that these two developments aroused not only the ever-ready Clodius to desperate energy, but the jealousy and apprehension of Crassus as well; with the result that Clodius, his 'populares,' and the tribune C. Cato are found to be working in alliance with Crassus and the extreme Optimates to checkmate Pompey. Insolent attacks by Clodius and his gang were made on Pompey; attempts to sow discord between him and Cicero were made by C. Cato precisely as Crassus himself had done in 62;<sup>8</sup> and Pompey 'said outright that he would take better precautions to protect his life than Africanus had done whom C. Carbo had assassinated'—a fairly obvious, but unnoticed, allusion, I believe, to the Campanian land affair. Cicero says, therefore, 'Great happenings appear to be in the wind . . . Clodius is rallying his gangs. . . . For that occasion we are considerably in a majority, owing to the forces brought up by Pompey himself.'

In his next letter to Quintus, Cicero mentions that Appius Claudius was away on a visit to Caesar.<sup>9</sup> This may not have had any connexion with the political situation; on the other hand it may; and it is at any rate an indication that his brother Clodius was not at feud with Caesar.

The event of these matters was that Cicero made a damaging attack upon Caesar in his interrogation of Vatinius in the case of Sestius, and then proceeded openly to renew the Campanian land agitation, while Pompey looked benignly on.<sup>10</sup> Crassus, however, betook himself to Caesar at Ravenna, and the conference of Lucca ensued. Pompey, unable to count on the support of the Optimates, and having received an advantageous offer from Caesar, changed his policy and left Cicero high and dry. The utility of Clodius to Caesar became more or less a thing of the past. Pompey probably made it a

<sup>1</sup> *Att.* IV. i. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Cf. Fam.* I. i. 3: 'quod eum ornasti.'

<sup>3</sup> *Att.* IV. i. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Cf. De domo*, 25-30.

<sup>5</sup> *Cf. Att.* IV. 2 and 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Cf. Fam.* I. i. 3: 'cui qui nolunt tibi sunt inimici quod eum ornasti,' and certain other passages.

<sup>7</sup> 'Asinus Germanus,' by M. Cary, *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII., which contains the key to most of the problems of the period and which I have closely followed.

<sup>8</sup> *Cf. Att.* I. 14.

<sup>9</sup> *Q. fr.* II. 5, 6.

<sup>10</sup> *Cf. Q. fr.* II. 5, 3 and *Ad fam.* I. 9, 9 and 12, and cf. 'Asinus Germanus.'

conditi  
and im  
W  
sugges  
and th  
fought  
did up  
might  
of this  
witcher  
is at a  
can be  
unimpe  
protag

Dr  
Caesar  
counsel  
(Vol. I  
*Cin.* I.  
leads h  
holds t  
cohorts  
Corfini  
says h  
Caesar  
with C  
In  
though  
Sicilia  
Again  
Africa  
Curio  
*Cin.* II  
Holme

<sup>1</sup> *Hist.*

<sup>2</sup> In  
probabl  
from Br  
*Att.* IX.  
Puteoli

condition that he should be dropped. In *Fam.* i. 7 Cicero talks of his futility and impotence.

Without elaborating these matters, I think enough has been said to suggest that the ordinary view of Clodius and his policy should be reconsidered, and that Mommsen, for instance, is off the mark when he says:<sup>1</sup> 'Clodius fought in turn for the ruling democracy, for the Senate, and for Crassus.' He did up to a point; but always on behalf of Caesar. Mommsen also says: 'We might as well seek to set a charivari to music as to attempt to write the history of this political witches' revel,' i.e. the tribunate of Clodius. But it is not a witches' revel; its history may be complicated, but is not irrational; and there is at any rate evidence from which to attempt to write it, which is more than can be said for the Laws of Caesar's Dictatorship. It is, moreover, a not unimportant period, and throws an interesting light on the characters of its protagonists.

L. G. POCKOCK.

### 'DOMITIANAE COHORTES.'

DR. RICE HOLMES has thrown a flood of light on innumerable passages in Caesar's Commentaries, but in one small matter he has, as I hope to show, darkened counsel. In his recent work on the Roman Republic and the founder of the Empire (Vol. III., pp. 369-71) his anxiety to retain the MSS. reading III. in Caesar (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 30. 2), 'Mittit . . . in Siciliam Curionem pro praetore cum legionibus III.,' leads him to pervert or neglect the plain meaning of other passages in Caesar. He holds that 'Curio was not sent to Sicily with<sup>2</sup> any legions,' and that the 'Domitian cohorts,' which Caesar says (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 25. 1) he sent to Sicily straightway from Corfinium, are identical with the *three* legions which Caesar (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 30. 2, u.s.) says he sent with Curio from Brundisium. Dr. Holmes believes that this was what Caesar really meant, though he expressed himself loosely. Let us see how it agrees with Caesar's other statements.

In *Bell. Ciu.* II. 23 Caesar distinctly says that he had given Curio *four* legions, though Curio took only *two* with him to Africa ('Curio in Africam profectus ex Sicilia . . . duas legiones ex IIII. quas a Caesare acceperat . . . transportabat'). Again in *Bell. Ciu.* II. 28 he definitely identifies the two legions which Curio took to Africa with those which had surrendered at Corfinium ('legionesque eas traduxerat Curio quas superioribus temporibus Corfinio receperat Caesar'). Cf. also *Bell. Ciu.* II. 32. 7 sq. The two legions left by Curio in Sicily are probably, as Dr. Rice Holmes suggests, those which we find stationed at Messana in August, 48 B.C. (*Bell.*

<sup>1</sup> *History of Rome* (Eng. trans.), Vol. V., p. III.

<sup>2</sup> In a sense this is doubtless true. Curio probably accompanied Caesar on his journey from Brundisium to Rome (March 20-30; cf. *ad Att.* IX. 15. 1), and was certainly at Cumae and Puteoli in the middle of April (*ad Att.* X. 4. 8 sq.;

5. 2; 7. 3), while the legions probably marched direct from Brundisium to Rhegium, at least 250 miles. But is this anything more than the not uncommon practice of a general's arrival at the last moment?

*Ciu.* III. 101. 3), and at Lilybaeum in December, 47 B.C. (*Bell. Afr.* I. 1). But surely it follows from the passages quoted that Curio was given exactly four legions, and that *two* of them are identical with the 'Domitianaes cohortes.'

Now this agrees very well with the number of cohorts that surrendered at Corfinium. Caesar puts Domitius' whole force at about thirty-three cohorts, some twenty of which he had raised himself (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 15. 5, 7). But seven of these were in garrison at Sulmo (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 18) and six at Alba Fucens (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 24. 3, cf. *ad Att.* VIII. 11. A. 1). It follows that only about twenty, or more exactly eighteen (cf. Rice Holmes, III. 371), actually surrendered at Corfinium. Now it is these troops (with the possible addition of the garrison at Sulmo) who would naturally be called 'the Domitian cohorts sent forthwith from Corfinium to Sicily' (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 25. 2), and these would be the men whom Domitius had deserted and betrayed (*Bell. Ciu.* II. 32. 7-10, cf. I. 19, 20). The cohorts from Alba, Tarracina, and other places who surrendered to Caesar while he was on the march to Brundisium (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 24. 3, 4), had neither been sent at once from Corfinium to Sicily, nor been betrayed by Domitius. They are only dragged in by Dr. Rice Holmes because they are necessary to complete his *three* legions.

But if we once admit that Caesar formed only *two* legions from the Domitian cohorts (as indeed is stated or implied in *Bell. Ciu.* II. 28, u.s.), all becomes clear. Curio's four legions (*Bell. Ciu.* II. 23, u.s.) are these cohorts sent on from Corfinium under Asinius Pollio (*Plut. Cat. Min.* 53; *App. Bell. Ciu.* II. 40), and *two* other legions of recruits sent from Brundisium (*Bell. Ciu.* I. 30. 2, u.s.). The only stumbling-block is the III. of the MSS. in that passage. Surely the editors who adopt there Hofmann's easy correction of II. for III. are right; and Dr. Holmes has neglected the cumulative evidence of a number of passages in the *Civil War* in his attempt to defend, not the text of Caesar, but the venial error of some unknown copyist.

W. W. How.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.

### 'VALERIUS PROBUS ON EARLY ACCENTUATION.'

PROFESSOR E. LINWOOD LEHMAN (of the University of Virginia) writes to point out that Professor W. M. Lindsay, following Christ, *Metrik*, p. 59, is in error in this note, as Gellius (*N.A.* VI. 7) gives Annianus, and not Probus, as his authority for the alleged older accentuation *exâduersum*, and Annianus only stated this as a matter of opinion.

IN  
the 'Ia  
prior s  
utteran  
of ut e  
(1)  
syllabi  
(2)  
stand f  
malum,  
Latin.  
(3)  
of the  
Al  
not hit

T  
Iambic  
probab  
withou  
conform  
questio  
etc., u  
nounce  
provisi

<sup>1</sup> Exp  
Andr.  
gau  
Haut.  
Em  
Hec. 3  
cur  
Phorm  
mal  
Haut.  
ego  
Hec.  
Hec.  
cal  
Eho  
an non,  
Andr.  
Dsecro,  
Andr.  
Phorm  
to call

## TERENTIANA.

(Continued from C.Q., Vol. XVI., pp. 163-174.)

In this paper it is proposed to be argued that the tendency in Latin known as the 'Iambic Law' is actuated by one cause, and one only—viz., the intensity of the prior syllable of the two. 'Intensity' means higher tone and increased force of utterance (*plus sonat*, Keil, 4, 426; *acuto accentu elatum*, as Charisius (K. 1, p. 227) says of *ut* exclamatory). It is of three kinds:

(1) Initial—proper to the first syllable of a disyllabic, tetrasyllabic, or pentasyllabic word of a sentence or (as Bentley first noted) of a verse.

(2) Appropriate to the sense of interrogatives (which therefore must normally stand first) and other words of natural emphasis, such as *ego*, or the expletives<sup>1</sup> *pol*, *malum*, or imperatives,<sup>2</sup> or words like *at* and *sed*, before which there is a pause in Latin.

(3) Attaching to particular words in a particular context because of the meaning of the sentence (cf. Donat. *ad Phorm.* 341, *acuenda uox in eo quod ait, 'tibi'.*)

Also it is proposed to bring into account another feature of the Latin senarius not hitherto detached or explained.

### I. INTENSITY AND IAMBIC-SHORTENING.

That all the various manifestations which are combined under the name of Iambic Law (German IKG), or *Breves Breviantes*, have a common basis, is a logical probability; that the universal basis cannot be metrical is self-evident, since, even without Lindsay's rehabilitation and extension of Bentley's arguments for the general conformity of Comic with colloquial rhythm, no metrical answer can be given to the question why *citō*, *benē*, *rogō*, *dedīt*, *domī*, *mihi*, *nisi*, *diū* are found, not *citō*, *benē*, *rogō*, etc., unless one supposes that poetry carelessly slurred what current speech pronounced correctly. And who can believe that? To that 'why' we can give a provisional answer in Dziatzko's words: 'Der auf der ersten Silbe ruhende, im

#### <sup>1</sup> Expletives:

*Andr.* 939 *ne istam multimodis tuam inueniri gaudeo.*

*Haut.* 866 *desponsam quoque esse dicito.* MEN.  
*Em istoc uolueram.*

*Hec.* 347 *hem istoc uerbo animus mihi redit et cura ex corde excessit.*

*Phorm.* 723 *datum esse dotis.* DE. *Quid tua malum id refert?* . . .

*Haut.* 730 *faciet nisi caueo.* BA. *Dormiunt. ego pol istos commouebo.*

*Hec.* 772 *nec pol istas metuunt deos* . . . (in *Hec.* 747 Dziatzko's *nec pol ista* is unmetrical).

*Eho* not merely shortens a subjoined *an* in *an non*, but even gives—

*Andr.* 781 *eam uxorem ducet.* MVS. *Eho oscecro, an non ciuis est?*

*Andr.* 489 *uel hoc quis non credat* . . .

*Phorm.* 143 . . . *uel dēcidito* (unless you prefer to call this *uel* an imperative still). Cf. *uel hic*

*qui me aperte effrenata impudentia Accius* (Ribb., p. 177).

#### <sup>2</sup> Imperatives:

*Hec.* 494 *iube illam redire* . . .

*Haut.* 332 *age, age, cedo istuc tuom consilium.*

*Eun.* 151 *sine illum priores partes.*

*Phorm.* 993 *qui hercle ubi sit nescit.* CH. *Caue isti quicquam creduas.*

*Phorm.* 784 *agedum, ut soles, Nausistrata, fac illa ut placetur nobis.*

*Eun.* 189 *tu, Parmeno, huc fac illi adducantur.*

*Eun.* 362 *fac ut potiar.*

As has been pointed out before, 'dominant' words have varying degrees of dominance: *quis* has the highest; a mere imperative has not force enough to reduce *hoc* in Terence:

*Eun.* 595 *cape hoc flabellum* (it would be rash to substitute *cape uentilabrum* from Lex. Maii).

*Haut.* 831 *cape hoc argentum ac defer* . . .

Or even in Plautus:

*Pseud.* 20 *cape has tabellas* . . .

Latin stark expiratorische, Wortakzent' (Dz.-Hauler<sup>4</sup>, *Phormio*, p. 59); or in those of Plessis, quoting Havet: 'La première syllabe d'un mot ou d'un groupe étant intense, il arrivait, si elle était brève et suivie d'une longue, qu'il y avait en latin une tendance à rétablir l'équilibre en abrégeant la longue. . . . L'intensité n'est autre chose que l'accent moderne, mais l'accent antique a un autre caractère' (*Métrique*, p. 295). Next, why *uolūptatem*, *pér-implūium*, etc.? Answer: Because Latin speakers could not pronounce (at the usual rate of utterance, without mouthing), or, if you prefer, would not be bothered, until a sort of literary legislation compelled them, to pronounce *ū*— or *u—* in attacking a word or a word-group measuring five morae. And the Comic poet, whatever Ennius might do in heroics, must compromise. There are not very many of these in Terence: *uolūptati* *Andr.* 944, 960, *Haut.* 71, cf. *Eun.* 1034, *Hec.* 593; *uolūntate* *Haut.* 1025; *uenūstatis* *Hec.* 848; *magīstratus* *Eun.* prol. 22; *dehōrtatus* *Phorm.* 910; *praeōptares* *Hec.* 532; *senēctutem* *Phorm.* 434; *uerēbamini* *Phorm.* 901 (Dz.-H., pp. 60, 268); *supēllectile* *Phorm.* 666; *puḍicitiam* *Andr.* 288. I do not reckon among these *deāmbulatum* *Haut.* 587, 806; *prodeāmbulare* *Ad.* 766; *coēmisse* *Ad.* 225.

The scansion *uolūptatem*, etc., is only allowed by Terence in the fourth foot, which (with the fifth) is of course the normal place for inversion of accent in a senarius: exx. *Haut.* 149; *Hec.* 69, 119, 858; *Phorm.* 403; *Ad.* 490.

It is notable that even in tragedy Ennius scanned *malām-pestem* (Ribb.<sup>3</sup>, p. 69), and probably *uerēcunde* (*ib.*, p. 42); Livius Andronicus scanned *Clytēestra*. The fragments of Caecilius preserve *senēctutem*, *magīstratus*, *gubērnator*. It is hard to believe that in Ribb.<sup>3</sup>, p. 49, we ought not to read <in> *egēstate aliquantisper iactati forent*. Titinius has *gubērnator*; Afranius, *uolūptatem* (initial); and even Pomponius *uolūptatibus*, but in the fourth-fifth feet of a senarius *uolūptati*.

Thirdly: Why *quis hic loquitur*?, *Sed hic Pamphilus, Quid istuc est*? etc. Some will answer: Because the word-group *quis-hic-loquitur* is, by slurring, exactly equivalent to *pér-implūium*. I gave reasons in a former article for not regarding *quis-hic-loquitur* as a 'word-group' in quite the same sense that *ob-edm-rem*, *intered-loci*, etc., are. It was never written *ūp* *ēv*. But even if this distinction be judged unimportant, it is vitally important to note that what is sometimes stated (e.g. Dziatzko-Hauler<sup>4</sup>, p. 59) is not a true account: viz. that any two monosyllables coalesce likewise and produce the same result. *Quis* abridges the subjoined syllable by its explosive intensity as an interrogative. It is the sense, the spoken force, of the words that makes the difference.

Here are the proofs:

*Phorm.* 38 nummorum: id ūt conficerem: confeci, adfero.

Cf. Caecilius (Ribb.<sup>3</sup>, p. 42) sepulchrum plenum taeniarum *ita ūt* solet.

*Haut.* 856 id ēst profecto: id amicae dabitur: scilicet

(But *quid ēst* would be impossible unless a full-stop followed.)

*Haut.* 495, 6 Dic. Quod sensisti illos me incipere fallere,

*id ūt* maturent. (However, G may be right in reading *id uti*.)

*Haut.* 354 Quasi *istic* mea res minor agatur quam tua.

contrasted with

*Eun.* 909 tu *istic mane*, ūt Chremem introducas, Pythias.

(But for the pause it would be *mane ūt*.)

*Eun.* 643 ubi *ego illum* scelerosum misera . . .?

contrasted with

*Eun.* 954 ille ubi *id* rescuiit factum . . .

And, in conclusion,

*Ad.* 656 *quid ipsae?* *Quid aiunt?*  
contrasted with

*Haut.* 779 *id ipsum*  
and *Eun.* 908 *id ipsum*. *Pv.* *id ipsum?*

If these are irreducible, then, I take it, there is still no valid objection to the statement that a native intensity in *quis ego sed at*<sup>1</sup> is what abridges a weak subsequent syllable.

Also the Pregnant Relative (*qui = is qui*), treated in a previous article (*C.Q.* XVI., pp. 166 sq.), has shown that it is not the mere monosyllabic length of the word, but its quality and meaning, which determine its abridging effect on the next syllable.

Thus a demonstrative which is 'recessive' when subjoined, in a weak sense, to *quis* or *ego* may in turn become intense, and reduce the quantity of another demonstrative subjoined in turn to itself. Thus we have *ego id timeo?* (*Eun.* 162). Here we have *id* recessive losing to *ego* its positional quantity; but when it bears an emphatic sense, it is differently pronounced, and therefore must be differently placed in the verse:

- (1) *Andr.* Prol. 15 *id isti* uituperant factum atque in eo disputant.

'THAT's their criticism . . .'

- (2) *Ad.* 451 de psalteria hac audiuit: *id illi* nunc dolet.

'THAT's what saddens him.'

- (3) *Ad.* 623 Sensi ilico *id illas* suspicari.

- (4) *Phorm.* 45 *id illa* uniuersum abripiet.

'THAT's the money she'll whisk away . . .'

- (5) *Eun.* 953 PA. Nescio. PY. Atqui sic inuentast: *eam istic* uitiauit miser.

'THAT's who she is . . .'

So also *Andr.* 787, *hic est ille*: non te credas Dauom ludere—like *quid est quod*. This *hic est ille* occurs even in Laberius (Ribb.,<sup>2</sup> p. 341), *hic est ille gurdus quem ego me abhinc mensés duos in África*; also cf. *Phorm.* 266.<sup>2</sup> Of course it is the emphatic significance of *id*, *eam* that throws it to the front of the sentence. It is to be remarked that we find *id iste*, *id ille*, *id istic*, but never *id ipsum*. *Ipsum* is always the more emphatic part of the combination. The Italian *il desso* confesses the accent of its origin. So that in *Ad.* 627, *ipsum id metuo ut credant: tot concurrunt ueri similia*, the MS. reading is sound and unobjectionable: Dziatzko's *id ipsum metuo . . .* is a false quantity and a contresens, for *id ipsum* = 'just that'; *ipsum id* = 'even that.'

The behaviour of *ipse* is instructive. Starting with *Phorm.* 809, consider it first with prepositions:

*eamus ad ipsam*:<sup>3</sup> una omnis nos aut scire aut nescire hoc uolo.

Which is it?—*eamus ad ipsam*, or *eamus ad ipsam*? The question is decided by

<sup>1</sup> To the Terentian instances, detailed in previous articles, it may be added that even in the tragic verse of Pacuvius we find:

«abiit» ubi illic est? me miseram! Quonam clam se eliminet (Ribb.,<sup>3</sup> p. 105);

and Accius:

Sed quis hic est qui matutinum . . . (ib., p. 175).

Quid est cur componere ausis mihi te aut me tibi? (ib., p. 179).

Pacuvius has also:

possum ego istam capite cladem auerruncassere (ib., 122).

and Accius:

Sed ut cuique (ib., p. 196). *Sed* implies a pause before it, for it was correct to punctuate before *sed* (Diomed. ap. Keil I., p. 437).

<sup>2</sup> In *Phorm.* 178 *is est ipsus* or *i'st ipsus* would do; but in *Andr.* 906 certe *is est*, before a full-stop and a change of speaker, is an impossibility. Read certe *i'st*; and likewise in *Ad.* 439 *i'st* hercle, which accounts for the reading of A.

<sup>3</sup> The phrase is colloquial: it happens to be preserved in a fragment of early prose: '*eamus ad ipsam*': atque ipsa commodi (commodum?) de parte superiore descendebat (Sisenna Milesiar. XIII. ap. Charisium, Keil, I., p. 196).

*Hec.* 627 Phidippe, in ipso tempore ostendis. Quid est?

*Ad.* 773 in ipsa turba atque in peccato maxumo.

But with these contrast

*Phorm.* 960 nunc, *quod ipsa* ex aliis auditura sit, Chremes, and (probably)

*Eun.* 449 quod doleat: metuit semper *quem ipsa* nunc capit fructum nequando iratus tu alio conferas.

*Hec.* 670 ut alamus nostrum. *Pa.* *Quem ipse* neclexit pater? For the explanation see *C.Q.* XVI., pp. 166 sq.

But now come two more difficult examples:

(1) *Haut.* 894 *Me.* Non. *Ch.* Quid? Non? *Me.* Non, inquam. *Ch.* *Neque ipse* gnatus? *Me.* Nil prorsum, Chremes.

Whence does *neque* derive its intensity? Partly from being initial (to the sentence), partly from emphasis, as representing *oûdê*.

(2) *Phorm.* 725 *uolo ipsius* quoque uoluntate haec fieri, ne se eiectam praedicet.

On this *Dz.-Hauler*<sup>4</sup> remarks, 'wenn *ipsius* zweisilbig gemessen u. nach einsilbigen *uol(o)* die erste Silbe verkürzt wird.' Then you scan

*uol' ipsius / quôquê uô/lüntât/e* haec fieri.

This may possibly be the right scansion, but *uol'* being a monosyllable does not settle the question, as the lately received doctrine taught us it did: *quod, nec, et* are all monosyllables, but comparison of the four lines—

*Phorm.* 960 nunc *quod ipsa* ex aliis auditura sit, Chremes.

*Andr.* 905 uel tu, uel quod uerumst, uel *quod ipsi* cupio Glycerio.

*Haut.* 894 *neque ipse* gnatus?

*Hec.* 161 illum diiunxit ab illa postquam *et ipse* se.

—shows how differently *ipse* was pronounced according as it combined with one or other of them. No; if *ipsius* is to be so scanned, the reason is that *uolo* has initial intensity, and (probably) also must have been pronounced with a certain petulance. In any case it is a rough verse (Terence's admirers regretted that he had not confined himself to trimeters, we know), whether we take *Dz.-Hauler's*

*uol' ipsius / quoquê uol/untate,*

or Bentley's

*uol' ipsiû' quoque uoluntate.*

*Fleckeisen* omitted *quoque*. Possibly Terence wrote,

*uol' et ipsiûs uolüntate,*

and *ipsius quoque* is a paraphrase-gloss of *et ipsius*.

One more pair of examples exhibit a test case for *et*:

*Hec.* 161 illum diiunxit ab illa postquam *et ipse* se (correct, since *et* is unemphatic).

*Ad.* 888 hoc uerumst *et ipsa* re experire<sup>1</sup> propediem.

Nothing justifies the shortening of *ipsa-re*; either *et* should be cut out (dittogram from ST) or *reapse* read. (Our MSS. nowhere give *reapse*, but *Fleckeisen* introduced it into various places, among them this—with better reason than he knew. We find *ipsa re* five times: *Andr.* 359; *Haut.* 266, 824; *Ad.* 733, 888; *reipsa* four times: *Phorm.* 889; *Hec.* 417, 778; *Ad.* 860; and in *Ad.* 955 A gives *reipsa*, the Calliopians *ipsare*).

Now in order to complete the demonstration that monosyllables only by (1) initial intensity or (2) intensity of significance, and not simply qua monosyllables, have the power to abridge a subjoined long syllable, we come to the crucial instances in *et* and *nec*. These afford crucial tests just because monosyllabic words are so scarce in Latin. It is necessary to show that true examples of *et hoc, nec iste*, due to a merely metrical stress on an unemphatic *et* or *nec*, are either none or practically none.

<sup>1</sup> By the way, the variant *EXPERIRE* in A<sup>1</sup> and D perhaps indicates an original *EXPERIBERE*, as in *Haut.* 824, *ipsa-re experibere*; though the No-

Proceleusmatics-in-the-Fifth-Foot party will not like it.

I n  
especial  
nor. So  
sentence  
Ha

I suppo

Ad.

WH

(neither

nec alibi

and the

cordia).

But

nam

the neg

recitatio

Pho

The ver

fail to a

The

Hec

Hec

(has is e

antithes

gods can

But

of Hec.

Hec

Wh

quid hōc

So

unemph

Pho

Ad.

„

but it is

Ad.

„

for 511 i

i.e. after

Ag

Ana

and „

Eun

<sup>1</sup> Cf. (P

Nec adm

I need hardly remark that *nor* and *and* may carry a strong emphasis in English, especially when the form of the sentence is antithetical: *both . . . and, neither . . . nor*. So also in French and Italian. And so evidently in Latin; for in such a sentence as,

*Haut*: 153 tractaret. Verum *nec* tu illum satis noueras  
*nec* te ille,

I suppose nobody denies that the actor emphasized his *nec . . . nec*.

*Ad*. 292 *nec* quem ad obstetricem mittam *nec* qui accersat Aeschinum.

Where single words are coupled in affirmation (*both . . . and*) or in negation (*neither . . . nor*), the words themselves may bear the emphasis (*And*. 420 *nec istic nec alibi* tibi erit usquam in me mora), or the emphasis fall alternately on the word and the particle (*Ad*. 306 quem *nēque* fides *neque* iusiurandum *nēque* illum misericordia).

But in cases like *Ad*. 272 (just cited) or *Hec*. 747,

nam *nēque* ille hoc animo erit aetatem, *nēque* pol tu eadem ista aetate,

the negative particles themselves are naturally the high points of emphasis in recitation.<sup>1</sup> So with a doubled *et*:

*Phorm*. 117 noster quid ageret nescire: *et* illam ducere  
cupiebat *et* metuebat

(‘he *did* want to marry her and *at the same time* was afraid’).

The very shape and sense of the phrase would be destroyed by an actor who should fail to accent the *et . . . et*.

The following are illustrations:

*Hec*. 512 quando *nec* gnatus *nēque* hic mi quicquam obtemperat.

*Hec*. 772 *nec* pól istae metuont deos *neque* hūs respicere deos opinor.

(*has* is emphatic, not recessive, because its case instantly suggests the point of the antithesis: *nec* *has* respiciunt dī: ‘they care nothing for the gods, nor for them do the gods care anything.’)

But an ordinary unemphatic *nec* (‘and not’) has no such effect as the *neque* hic of *Hec*. 512:

*Hec*. 877 PAR. Immōuero scio *neque* hōc imprudens feci . . .

Whereas, as has been pointed out many times in the course of these articles, *quid hōc* and *ego hōc* would be inadmissible.

So it is with *is*, *iste*, *istic*: their positional quantity is not reduced by an unemphatic *et* or *nec* preceding, unless there be initial intensity. Thus we have:

*Phorm*. 588 scio ita esse *et* istaec mihi res sollicitudinist.

*Ad*. 558 rogitas? Ctesipho me pugnis miserum *et* istam psaltriam.

„ 842 hodiē modo hīlarum fac te *et* istam psaltriam (*te fac*, Calliop.),

but it is not necessary to except

*Ad*. 511 bono animo fac sis, Sostr/āta, *et* ist/am quod potes . . .

„ 521 ita fi/āt—*et* istoc siqui potis est rectius . . .

for 511 is perhaps spurious (Donatus) and in 521 *et istoc* is added aside (Don. again), i.e. after a pause; and all prove that a weak *et* will not do the trick.

Again, though initial intensity may give:

*Andr*. 924 *et* istaec una parua uirgo: tum ille egens forte applicat,

and „ 42 *Et* id gratum fuisse aduersum te habeo gratiam.

*Eun*. 1080 *Nec* istum metuas ne amet mulier: facile pellas ubi uelis.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. (Ribbeck<sup>3</sup>, *Frag. Com.*, p. 11) Naevius’ adulescentulust.  
Nec admodum a pueris abscessit nec admodum

Where the words are medial and not initial, we have:

*Andr.* 653 Sciō: cum patre altercasti dudum *et is* nunc propterea tibi.

„ 840 credo, *et id* facturas Dauos dudum praedixit mihi.

For *Eun.* 570 *neque is* deductus etiamdum ad eam. Summonuit me Parmeno.

The variants suggest that the right reading is:

*neque is etiamdum ad eam erat deductus.*

We have seen that intensity varies in degree: the higher the emphasis on the Breviant syllable, the larger will be the range of Breviates. As might be expected, the power exerted by even the most emphatic *et* or *nec* is less than that exerted by *quid* or *ego*. Outside of the Recessive Demonstratives there is only *Hec.* 851, nam *neque in-nuntio neque in-me-ipso* tibi quid sit boni scio. Cf. *Quid interea?* *Ego in-portu* (*Andr.* 480), etc., and a single (initial) *neque intelleges*, *Phorm.* 806.

There are still one or two hard cases to discuss:

- (1) *Eun.* 160 PHAE. nisi si illum plus quam *mé* amas et istam nunc times (plus amas quam me *codd.*: *correx* Bentley)  
*quae adulectast*, ne illum talem praeripiat tibi.  
 THAIS. Ego id timeo?

The reading is doubly objectionable, for *et* is unemphatic, and *istam*, since its relative follows (*quae adulectast*) normally requires to be in the forte of the foot (see *C.Q.* XVI., pp. 171-4). The only variant is in the Bembine Scholiast on *Eun.* 231:

*et tam times.*

Thais' answer, 'Ego *id* timeo?' suggests that Phaedria's words were: 'You shut the door on me; you let me in. Why? What can the reason be except that you love him better than me? *That's why* you're afraid of her. . . .'

*I.e.* it (=id) *istam* nunc times.

- (2) *Phorm.* 1000 (cf. *C.Q.* XVI., p. 174):

PHORM. Recte sane, quando nihil times  
*et hoc* nihil est *quod* ego dico, tu narra. DE. Scelus.

Initial *et hoc* is not in itself fatally objectionable, but it is objectionable that *hoc* should be in the faible and *quod* in the forte. I think we should repunctuate the phrase:

*quando nihil times*  
*et hoc* nihil est; *quod* ego dico, tu narra

('You tell my story instead'). But an equally simple solution is to leave out *hoc* on the authority of D.

- (3) *Ad.* 745 *neque est neque illam* sane studeo uendere.

This passage I have discussed elsewhere (*Mnemosyne*, Vol. L., p. 447), and suggested that for these lame and unmeaning words we should read:

*nec istanc ancillam* sane studeo uendere.

From Afranius ap. Ribb.,<sup>3</sup> p. 238, nothing can safely be inferred. I read the line as iambic:

pro manibus ego illos credo habere <quemque> tentipellium.

- (4) A curious and unique<sup>1</sup> phenomenon, hard to believe genuine, is *Eun.* 305:

Unde is? CHAER. Egone? nescio hercle *nēque unde* eam  
*neque quorsum* eam.

egone nescio A; ego nescio *Calliop.* Not that the mere consonants *nd* are an obstacle: at least, Caecilius could write:

Quem neque quo pacto fallam nec *quid inde*<sup>2</sup> auferam (Ribb., p. 79).

<sup>1</sup> Not to be paralleled by *Haut.* 978,  
 Sv. abiit. uah, rogasse uellem. . . . Cl. Quid?

Sv. Unde mihi peterem cibum,  
 which is accounted for by the extreme rapidity of

Clitipho's interjection hardly interrupting Syrus' sentence.

<sup>2</sup> Doubtless nothing was heard but *quid in*.

As I  
 Breviant  
 example  
 exertion

I ha  
 ille alone  
 articles t  
 have bee  
 nobody c  
 different

Nec  
 to the ver

Et i  
 Ad. 523,

Phorm. 5  
 Cons

unless at  
 How

(1) I

(2) I  
 (3) E  
 (4) E

In (1  
 'The orph

In (2  
 interpolat

and the le  
 Terence,

In (3  
 In (4

example  
 adjective

There  
 reduce  
 referred  
 convenien  
 a Latin s  
*malām-cruc*  
 and all th  
 iamb + ian  
 it with a r  
 besetting  
 than the C  
 the stage  
 systematic  
 speed of th

<sup>1</sup> Also we  
 (Keil, G.L.

As long as one had only to mutter the spell IKG, 'loi des iambes,' 'Breves Breviantes,' such things passed; but who can produce from Terence another example of an interrogative so reduced in quantity? And by a mere *nec*! Such an exertion of power would have been astonishing even for *quis*. Read:

Unde is? CHAER. Egone? *Néc* scio hercle *ego* unde eam  
neque quorsum eam.

I have here confined myself to the consideration of *nec iste, nec hic*, and left *nec ille* alone. Perhaps an apology should be offered for my having in the former articles treated the abridgments of *hic, iste, ipse, ille* as all parallel. *Ille* should rather have been reserved to the category of *esse*. Whether Terence actually wrote *ese, ile*, nobody can tell; but the reduction of the positional quantity of *istum* or *hunc* is a different exercise of power in the Breviant.<sup>1</sup>

*Nec ille* is normal in Terence, whether *nec* be single or doubled, whether initial to the verse (*Hec.* 713, *Haut.* 215) or medial (*Eun.* 667, *Phorm.* 97).

*Et ille*, where *et* is doubled or emphasized, is found in *Phorm.* 117, *Ad.* 692, *Ad.* 523, *Eun.* 723, *Hec.* 599 (doubtful); and in the first foot frequently: *Andr.* 868, *Phorm.* 564, *Ad.* 694, *Eun.* 71, 498, *Haut.* 854, *Hec.* 112, 401.

Consequently I base no part of my argument on the recessive behaviour of *ille*, unless at least *hic, is, iste* are found behaving likewise.

However, a few special cases of *et ille* deserve a word:

- (1) *Phorm.* 125-6 *lex est ut orbae, qui sint genere proxumi,*  
*eis nubant: et illos ducere eadem haec lex iubet.*
- (2) *Hec.* 344 *laborem inanem ipso capit et illi molestiam adfert.*
- (3) *Eun.* 383 *deducar, et illis crucibus quae nos nostramque adulescentiam.*
- (4) *Eun.* 418-9 *hominem perditum*  
*miserumque et illum sacrilegum! Th. Quid illud, Gnatho.*

In (1) the form of the sentence *lex est . . . eadem lex iubet* makes the *et* emphatic. 'The orphan is bound, AND the kinsman is bound on his part.'

In (2) *et* would be better away: '*laborem inanem ipso capit, illi . . .*' The interpolation of an *et* is not unaccountable, for Low Latin does not like asyndeta, and the lengthening of *capit* was not within the scribe's habits. Credit him, and not Terence, with that *et*.

In (3) *et* is doubled, and *illis* is weak, *pro articulo*.

In (4) the text is so doubtful that it cannot safely be claimed as a sound example of *et illum*. Do not the letters *QUE ET ILLUM* rather represent some third adjective in the enumeration *perditum, miserum, . . . , sacrilegum*?

## II. LAW OF THE DI-IAMBUS IN SENARIIS.

There is yet another manifestation of Iambic Law (the tendency in Latin to reduce 6- to 600) exhibited in a metrical fact which I do not remember to have seen referred to this cause: e.g. to take Dziatzko-Hauser<sup>1</sup>, *Phormio* (p. 43) again as a convenient witness to the received view, they merely repeat the statement that a Latin senarius must not end in two iambs, unless these form a group such as *malâm-crucem*, or contain an elision. The fact is certain; both Plautus and Terence, and all the other comic writers in the extant fragments, do eschew the ending iamb + iamb. But what is the rationale of this restriction? We can now correlate it with a number of other facts. It is a measure taken by the poets against the besetting sin of gabbling. The Latin poets give much more weight to their lines than the Greek: not only Ennius, 'whose verses came bumping and crashing on to the stage,' as Horace (*A.P.* 260) remarks, but the classical hexameter-poets systematically, by the practice of inverting the accent, put a brake on the runaway speed of the verse. A Virgilian hexameter has seldom less than two such inversions

<sup>1</sup> Also we are assured by Marius Victorinus that *nec hoc* and *nec illud* were hyphenated words. (Keil, *G.L.* VI. 23), if I understand him rightly,

or conflicts, extending as far as the fourth foot, very rarely the fifth. Terence's trimeter likes best to have it in the fifth:

quod mihi uidere praeter aetatem tuam  
facere et praeterquam res te adhortatur tua  
quod in opere faciundo operae consumis tuae,

which weights the verse and stays it from running away. So also do endings of the type *quicquam fuit, nemo siet*, etc. But if Terence had given his actor an ending to pronounce, such as Prudentius could use six centuries later,

Deum perennem findit in dūōs dēōs,

that native bias inherent in the Latin language until after his day, which we call 'Iambic Law,' would have been too strong for the actor, and forced him to say *dūōs deos*. So the reason which proscribes an ending like *duos deos* may be expressed in this formula: inversion of accent on an iambic word is not admitted in the fifth foot.

The tendency of the language is to turn that *duōs* into *duōs*. But give an actor

*licere speras facere me uiuo patre,*

and he will allow full value to the intensity of *ui-* and still do justice to the movement of the rhythm emphasizing *-uo*. The inversion of accent is a means of slowing the rhythm just because it tends to equalize the *faible* with the *forte* in a particular foot. When the foot is an iambus—suppose the verse to be

*licere speras facere me bono patre—*

the native tendency of the language inclines him, in a manner compels him, to say *bōnō patre*, in which case the verse is ruined. Well, this tendency allows itself to be overcome in the sixth foot by the pause after the completion of the verse; but in the first foot what happens? Takes such a verse as

*dies noctesque me ames, me desideres:*

a certain discipline is exercised to prevent the actor from saying *diēs*, for such would be the natural pronunciation produced by initial intensity. But verse is a compromise between art and nature; there must be give and take. If the poet requires the actor to do justice to the long syllable and pronounce the theoretically correct iambus *diēs*, there is one necessary stipulation: the literary, theoretical, value can be maintained in the first foot, provided the second foot shall not also consist of a single iambic word unelided. That is to say, the effort of voice-management must not be exacted twice running; that would be more than the tongue could bear, and to the hearers also the effect would be too 'quaint and mouthy.'

But this rule, which implies the key to the other, has—so far as I know—not been observed and detached. It has no counterpart in Menander's metric—e.g. the first hundred lines of *Epitrepontes* offer ὅπως ἔχει—ποεῖς μίαν—ἐὰν λαλήῃς. But there are in Terence no exceptions to it but such as are exactly analogous to the treatment of the di-iambus in the fifth and sixth feet—viz. both feet may be iambs if they are formed by—

(1) A single di-iambic word: *potissimum* (*Andr.* 454), *remiserim* (*Phorm.* 929).

(2) A group, whether with an enclitic: *bonam fide* (*Haut.* 761), *mālo quidem-me* (*Haut.* 135); or without: *heri minas-uiginti* (*Eun.* 169), *minās-decem* (*Ad.* 242), *uirium-bonum*, 'le bonhomme' (*Eun.* 918) (cf. *ill'-bōnūs-uir*, *Phorm.* 638, *Ad.* 476), *bonam-bonis-prognatam* (*Phorm.* 115).

(3) An elision: *tuam in fidem* (*Hec.* 109),<sup>1</sup> *decem ob minas* (*Phorm.* 662), *habet bonorum exemplum* (*Haut.* 20).

All others conform. 'Did I say all? No; one was lame,' though it was not Terence that lamed it, but his editors. We have in *Phorm.* 958:

<sup>1</sup> Contrast *bonā fide* in Laberius, Ribb.,<sup>2</sup> p. 356.

Terence's

*uides peccatum tuum esse elatum foras (sic codd. omnes).*

Thinking it hardly conceivable that *tuum* should be in hiatus, Erasmus conjectured,

*uides tuum peccatum esse elatum foras,*

and Fleckeisen, Dziatzko-Hauler, Tyrrell and Co., all say ditto. But it will not scan. It looked simple, and it violated no express rule; but that ear of Bentley's somehow knew that it would not do:<sup>1</sup> he wrote,

*uides peccatum tuum hoc esse elatum foras.*

As usual, once you begin to think, it is difficult to get past Bentley's reading, unless one should prefer:

*uides tuum elatum esse peccatum foras.*

Evidently this observation about the initial di-iambus sets in a new light the regulation about the final di-iambus. It is not likely that there are two different *raisons d'être*: but we shall see that the account usually given why such an ending as *bono patre* was proscribed is quite unfit to explain why such a beginning should be proscribed. 'The audience (or was it the actor?), on hearing an iamb *bōnō*, concluded,' we are told, 'that the verse was finished, and experienced a disagreeable shock on hearing yet another iamb.' *Apparet varus*. An iamb was such an event in the mob of resolved and substituted feet! The theory had its humorous value; but as an explanation of facts it will not serve—at least, I do not see how it is applicable to the same phenomenon occurring at the other end of the verse: which condemns it to Ockham's razor.<sup>2</sup> But there is a cause adequate to account for both these phenomena as well as for many others in Latin dramatic verse—viz. the inability (or, at least, the great unreadiness) of the Latin speaking-organs to pronounce *o*—, a disyllable with the first short and the second long. Their ear instinctively favoured the *genus par* 'for speaking verse'; in the *genera duplex* and *sescuplex* they only had occasionally *tours de force*, such as a Plautine canticum or a Catullus' *Attis*, the pure iambics of Catullus and Horace.

NOTE.—The same practice is found in Plautus. I have only noticed the following exceptions:

In Plautus (Lindsay's text), not counting instances like *Poen.* 1332 *bonūm-uirum*, 'le bonhomme'; *Poen.* 1349, *Rud.* 783 *meaē-quidem*; *Trin.* 541 *oues scabraē-sunt*, which readily explain themselves to anybody familiar with Lindsay's groups, there remain only:

<sup>1</sup> Romain was not satisfied either; but I agree with Hauler in finding his suggestion rhythmically undesirable. Romain wrote: '*uides tuum esse elatum peccatum foras.*'

<sup>2</sup> When this paper was drafted I had not yet had the benefit of reading Professor Lindsay's *Early Latin Verse*. In this work (p. 271) he suggests that the canon of the final di-iambus has an accentual *raison d'être*; Marx (quoted in his footnote) says that the reason why an ending such as *negat uirum* was forbidden is still unknown. It is curious that even Catullus' pure iambics (IV. and XXIX.) show only two exceptions: initial *opus foret* (IV. 5) and *potest pati* (XXIX. 1). Horace in the *Epodes* has iamb + iamb initial twice (VI. 11 and XVII. 19), and final four times (I. 16, V. 7, IX. 33, XVI. 66). The canon obtains in the tragic senarii of Seneca absolutely in respect of the last dipody; there is no example in any of the plays, *Octavia*

included, of an iambic word forming the fifth foot. In respect of the first dipody the statistic is as follows:

*Oedipus* } none.  
*Octavia* }

*Herc. Furens* 359 *noui parat*.

*Troades* 207 *uelis licet*.

*Phoenissae* 104 (?) *meae penes-me est*, 134 *aui gener*, 201 *malis tuis*, 337 *adhuc iuuat*.

*Medea* 228 *precor breuem*, 539 *potest fugam*, 897 *amas adhuc*, 911 *iuuat, iuuat*.

*Phaedra* 637 *libet loqui*, 709 (?) *datus tuis est*.

*Agamemnon* 991 *inops*, *egens* (?) *egena*.

*Thyestes* 263 *tonat dies*, 442 *pater, potes*, 454 *malan bonae*, 526 *pares meis* (a variant gives 'quales mei sunt'), 720 (?) *stetit suisecurus*.

*Herc. Oetaeus* 911 *placet scelus*, 1333 *adhuc malis*, 1830 *erunt satis*.

Only a score of examples in the ten plays.

*Men.* 747 patrem meum, qui huc aduenit (perhaps *patrem-meum* like *pater-mi*, perhaps *pātrēm*).

*Merc.* 291 senex uetus decrepitus (one might suggest [*senex*] <*uietus*> *uetus decrepitus*; cf. *Ter. Eun.* 688).

„ 777 drachmam dato (read *drachumam*, or scan *drāchmam*).

*Most.* meum bonum me, te tuom maneat malum.

And two more, which are significant because both occur in Prologues :

*Asin.* 13 inēst lēpōs ludusque in hac comoedia. This may inspire a fresh doubt on Leo's *comprobaui* of the genuineness of this Prologue.

and *Aul.* 38 ānūm fōrās extrudit ne sit conscia (unless *foras-extrudit* is a group, like *forās-aperis*, *Eun.* 284, *Ad.* 167, and cf. *Plaut. Mil.* 328, 410).

To resume, then—a logically satisfactory cause for Iambic Abridgment has to account for all the following phenomena :

(1) The reduction of the final in disyllables (*bene, rogo*) theoretically iambic, quite apart from any metrical rule.

(2) The normal reduction of the second syllable in words or word-groups of six morae in length.

(3) The normal (if not universal) reduction of the initial syllable of a weak demonstrative pronoun when subjoined to interrogatives.

(4) The same effect produced (to a more limited extent) by certain, but not all, monosyllabic words :

(5) This variation dependent on the meaning of the monosyllable concerned.

(6) The enormously greater frequency of *initial* Iambic Abridgment at (a) the beginning of the verse, (b) the principal caesura, (c) the beginning of a sentence.

(7) The rule that an iambus-word must only suffer an inversion of accent (i.e. non-coincidence of the syllable *quae plus sonat*, with the forte of the foot) when it is placed in the first or the last foot of the senarius.

Now I will set down in words borrowed from Dziatzko-Hauley (1913), p. 59; what the current doctrine asks us to believe :

‘1. Iambic Abridgment takes place where the first of two monosyllabic words has the Verse-Accent; and

‘2. Where the first syllable of the following word has the Verse-Accent.’

Rather as if one should say that a man is Lord Chancellor of England when he sits on the Woolsack and receives £10,000 per annum. Evidently the answer does not even begin to satisfy. Is it because too many factors are missing to the problem?

But even if the problem were too vague and the other desiderata not sufficient to allow a definite answer, we should not be at the end of our resources. We are not condemned to wander in a circle. There is an exterior piece of evidence possible to be adduced. We are not left with only comic verse to explain the secrets of comic verse: for not only are we logically bound to go outside of comic verse by Desideratum No. 1, but we are enabled by Desideratum No. 3 to bring in a new witness. We find that the interrogative by the greater frequency (not to say absolute regularity) and the wider range of its exercise deserves to be regarded as typical amongst the other words which have the breuiating effect; and we have

separate  
XXXIV

It is  
this an  
accentu  
operate

If w  
part of  
K. I., p.  
ment of  
(2) signi  
relief co  
rationale  
of the d  
It is the  
have eno  
by new  
acknowl  
to conn  
ruling p  
not norm  
quantity  
venient c  
of what

This  
artists, v  
and the  
their ins  
great en  
congenia  
was urge  
comic-op  
most pa  
adjustme  
Menandr  
Virgil k  
process o  
what a  
Fine dis  
he woul  
quantita

Loo  
no man  
or simpl  
language  
of his rel

Lik  
Luc  
Wh

<sup>1</sup> See th  
donagh (+

separate and independent evidence from the grammarians (see C.R. XXXII. 102 and XXXIV. 57-62) that the interrogative was intense.

It is surely a sound method to inquire whether this intensity in the interrogative, this *anima uocis* (Keil, *G.L.* 5, 126), the fact that it *plus sonat* (*ibid.*), that it is *acuto accentu elatum*, which gives it the breuiating power in an exceptional degree, may not operate in other words also. No great effort of hypothesis is required.

If we suppose that Intensity is of two kinds—(1) initial, not only as a mechanical part of Latin speech (*in dissyllabis partibus orationis prior syllaba . . . acuitur*, Charisius, K. I., p. 432), with no relation to phrase or verse, but also as affecting the commencement of any unit of expression, whether natural (a sentence) or artistic (a verse); and (2) significant, serving to place a point of emphasis, to throw one word into special relief corresponding to its logical or emotional importance, then we do find that the rationale of *noliptatem* of *quis hic loquitur*, of *sed istuc*, of *benē* for *benē*, and of the law of the double iamb, is one and the same. But there is no discovery to brag about. It is the explanation given long ago by Havet which in this series of investigations I have endeavoured to restore from systematic oblivion, and, if possible, to reinforce by new collateral proofs. If there has been deferred till this opportunity a full acknowledgment of my obligation to that illustrious veteran Latinist, it was in order to connect his name, not with any detail in the structure of inference, but with the ruling principle, which expressed in its simplest terms is this: 'The Romans could not normally pronounce *c*—without the intensity of the first syllable reducing the quantity of the second.' The traditional name 'Breves Breviantes' is not inconvenient or inaccurate; but *Brevis plus sonans breuiat* would be a more complete account of what happens to the second syllable.

This then was a quality (a weakness, you may say) ingrained in Latin. Literary artists, whether individual (like Ennius) or, still more, forming a coterie like Terence and the Scipionic Circle, have to consider the capacities and the inherent defects of their instrument. Popular Latin was infected by the vices of slurring and gabbling, great enemies to poetry of the sort which, from Terence to Prudentius, was peculiarly congenial to the cultivated Roman, recited not sung, 'speaking verse.'<sup>1</sup> The question was urgent for the Terentian type of comedy, of which (unlike the popular Plautine comic-opera) the main business was conducted in *senarii*, the tone maintained for the most part above the farcical, and often brought near to the tragical. Very nice adjustments were required in order that Latin comedy should assume a literary form, Menandrian in elegance, and yet not lose her popular appeal. Terence knew—as Virgil knew, as all stylists know—that the colour of a style is got mainly by a process of exclusion. It is only one part of elegance, but it is *intimae artis* to note what a stylist does not say; crude styles are characterized by what they do say. Fine discrimination was required. Some popular irregularities he must have, some he would proscribe. Perhaps the most urgent question in his programme was the quantitative value of dissyllables.

Look at an example. The second vowel of *homo* is long, said Ennius, by theory; no man writing in the grand style must write *homō*. But what if everyone, learned or simple, says *homō*? That is because they do not know how to speak their own language properly for the grand style, said Ennius, and planted down as a monument of his reform:

Unus homō nobis cunctando restituit rem.

Likewise in tragedy: *homō qui erranti* (Ribb.,<sup>3</sup> p. 78).

Lucilius said ditto: 'es homō miser' inquit; and Samnis, *spurcus homō*.

What will Terence and Co. do? The answer is easily collected.

<sup>1</sup> See the admirable little book by J. Macdonagh (†1916), *Thomas Campion and the Art of English Poetry*, Dublin, 1912.

Terence uses *homo* forty-five times;<sup>1</sup> of these, twenty-four times in elision (*Andr.* 344, 663, 744, 965, 974; *Eun.* 408, 543, 549, 804, 976; *Haut.* 1003; *Phorm.* 375, 509, 562, 642, 774, 991, 1041; *Ad.* 111, 431, 441, 883, 959, 982); nine times with the final *o* short (*Andr.* 778; *Eun.* 261, 358,<sup>2</sup> 960; *Haut.* 825;<sup>3</sup> *Hec.* 459, 828, 861; *Ad.* 407); at the end of the verse, so that the quantity is obscured, five times (*Eun.* 676; *Ad.* 107, 143, 716, 934).

And does he never conform to Ennius' canon? There are two examples of *homō-sum*: the celebrated

*homō-sum*: *humāni nihil a me aliēnum puto* (*Haut.* 77),

and

*né ego homō-sum infélix: fratrem nusquam inuenio gentium* (*Ad.* 540)

(cf.: *sed quam citō-sunt consecutae mulieres*, *Haut.* 375); a third,<sup>4</sup> in which the MSS. are at sixes and sevens (*Haut.* 825); and there are four others which demand separate examination:

(1) *Haut.* 205 *unius modi sunt ferme: paulo qui est homo tolerabilis.*

The scansion *homō* might be possible, but the expression is so odd that the genuineness of the tradition is questionable. (Perhaps, *quoiust mos tolerabilis*, cf. *Haut.* 393; perhaps, *qui homō sit tolerabilis*.)

(2) *Haut.* 731 *Mea Phrygia, audisti modo iste homō quam uillam demonstrat.* (BCFP) *audistin modo homo iste*

*Modo iste, homō*, and thirdly the variant order in BCFP, make a cumulative suspicion that the text is not truly reported. If, as would appear, *quam* is interrogative, then its position in the faible is a fourth reason. Perhaps read:

*Mea Phrygia, audistin? Quām modo iste homō uillam demonstrat?*

(3) *Phorm.* 123 *Homō confidens: qui illum di omnes perduint.*

It is highly improbable that at the beginning of the verse, of all places, *homō* could stand, unless we suppose a heavy pause between *homo* and *confidens*; but neither is it probable that Geta—the explosive Geta, of all people—pauses for a word. I suggest that he breaks off after *est parasitus quidam*, *Phormio*, into a double exclamation:

*O homō confidens! Qui illum di omnes perduint!*

in which *O* balances *qui*.

(4) *Phorm.* 362 *nihil est quod suscenseam*  
*si illum minus norat: quippe homō iam grandior.*  
(E) *homō natu grandior.*

The reading of E (Riccardianus), although unsupported by the other Calliopians, is recommended by the phrase *natu grandior* in *Ad.* 930.

I collect that Terence only said *homō sum* and perhaps *homō's*, otherwise always *homō*.<sup>5</sup> But now look at the Augustans. Grammarians doubtless asserted (with a long prescription in their favour) that *homō* was the correct scansion, but Horace only once uses it, in a probably Lucilian line,

*quidam notus homō cum exiret fornice . . .* (*Sat.* I. ii. 31),

and Virgil never uses it unelided. Their theory can be inferred from their practice.

<sup>1</sup> Lemaire's index, pending the publication of Mr. McGlynn's promised Lexicon to Terence.

<sup>2</sup> So A.

<sup>3</sup> So DG; the MSS vary greatly.

<sup>4</sup> Probably we should read: *nē ego homō fortunatus: deāmo te, Syre.*

<sup>5</sup> Afranius has *homō* (Ribb.,<sup>3</sup> p. 254).

Just so V  
uolō. An

we may b  
Horace h  
sciō (Buc  
The case  
Pyrrhich  
Lucilius  
Horace p

We  
when Te  
contrary  
so every  
problem  
extent ca  
qualism  
When u  
also be  
matter o  
because  
his lang  
Quid ēst  
stilted a  
delivery  
iambi.  
certain  
will hav

It  
Plessis  
iambic  
scanning  
in the p  
with the

but Ph

(A seve  
Keil. V  
Ch

but his  
tragic

(and in  
a meas

<sup>1</sup> Pac  
<sup>2</sup> But  
Ennius

Just so Virgil never uses *uolō* at all; Horace only once (*Sat.* I. ix. 17), and scanned *uolō*. And if Virgil wrote

Phyllida amo ante alias (*Buc.* III. 78),

we may be sure that for him *amo* was a pyrrhic. *Amō* once in Horace (*Sat.* I. ii. 115). Horace has *putō* (probably) (*Sat.* II. iv. 32), never *putō*, nor has Virgil. Virgil has *sciō* (*Buc.* VIII. 43). Horace elides *rogō*<sup>1</sup> (*Ep.* I. i. 11); Virgil avoids it altogether. The case is like Queen Elizabeth's: 'Madam I cannot; Mistress I would not.' Pyrrhichized it is too vulgar; given the value of an iambus it is too affected. Lucilius did allow himself *tamēsi* (*tamēsi id non quaeris, docebo*), but Virgil and Horace proscribe the word.

We are apt to take a topsy-turvy view of the matter. It is not Poetic License when Terence's actor says *sciās posse* or *rogō*: *negat* or *habēt despiciatū*: quite the contrary. He is talking as people talked off the boards: *homō, domī, sciās*, etc., so everybody pronounced—except the purists of a conscious reform. Terence's problem of art is, How much can the public stand—across the footlights? To what extent can the Ennian law be enforced? He must manage and temper his colloquialisms. It remains to inquire, On what principle? Surely not at haphazard. When *uocem comoedia tollit*, the tone of diction and the accuracy of pronunciation will also be raised, and an unfamiliar correctness will not sound stilted. It is largely a matter of the pace of speech. If the Romans slurred their pronunciation, that was because they gabbled; gabbling produces slurring. What can the poet do to rescue his language from indignity and maltreatment? He cannot ask the actor to say *Quid ēst quod* when everybody said *Quid ēst quod* or *Quid ēst quōd*.<sup>2</sup> That would be stilted and absurd. But he can and does require him to vary the pace of his delivery, and by that means to modify the murderous wholesale pyrrhichizing of his iambs. In other words, it is the tempo of a given scene which determines whether certain words and phrases shall be pronounced popular-wise or as correct speakers will have them.

It is possible, therefore, to give a little more definition to the statement of Plessis (*s'abrégent à volonté*) and Dziatzko-Hauler (*die Möglichkeit*, etc.) about iambic shortening: the variation is not quite capricious, not as indifferent as, say, scanning *tenēbrae* or *tenēbrae*. Neither is it owing to imperfect metrical competence in the poet—need it be said? No; it is an index to the tone, and the tone varies with the person and the scene. E.g. Crito Senex declaims pompously (*Andr.* 796)

*in hāc habitasse platea dictumst Chrysidem,*

but Phormio Parasitus rattles off (*Phorm.* 370)

*ob hānc inimicitias caperem in nostram familiam.*

(A seventeen-syllable senarius! The maximum according to Marius Victorinus, Keil. VI. 79.)

Chaerea in rapid agitated narrative says,

*in hānc nostram plateam (Eun.* 344);<sup>3</sup>

but his elder brother, doing a 'pathetic touch' to Thais (*ib.*, 171), uses a more tragical tone:

*ob hāc facta abs te spernor*

(and in the two preceding lines *herī* and *tamēn* in the first foot). These give us a measure for the gravity of his tone. Why have we

*tacēt*: *satis laudant (Eun.* 476),

<sup>1</sup> Pacuvius has *rogō*, Ribb.,<sup>2</sup> p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> But if we may trust *Frag. Com.* (Ribb.,<sup>2</sup> p. 5) Ennius actually did begin an iambic line with

*quis ēst qui foribus nostris.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Ad.* 332 *qui sine hāc iurabat . . . Eun.* 190 *in hōc biduom.*

but in *Ad.* 639

*tacēt? Cur non ludo . . . ?*

Surely because in the former case the dignified Parmeno pauses after his *tacent*:—the tone of his speech is impertinently cool and deliberate; whereas in the latter Micio is expressing a sudden thought in a hasty aside. So again in *Ad.* 88 Terence writes *forēs cefregit* because Demea is delitigating 'tumido ore' almost at the tragedy pitch; but he allows the colloquial *forēs* to go its slipshod Plautine way when it is coupled in the common phrase *forēs-aperi* (*Eun.* 284, *Ad.* 167. Cf. Trabea's *forēs patebunt* (Ribb.<sup>3</sup> *Fr. Com.*, p. 36). And so forth.

Where, then, are we to look for the metrical differentia of Terence's comic style? The slurring that results from groups or phrases was idiomatic, and no less 'urbane' than the dropping of the final *s* after a short vowel. He did not interfere with the customary *quid-est-quod, quis-hic-loquitur*. He modified the practice of allowing initial intensity in a monosyllable to reduce the syllable subjoined according to the tempo of the scene (see p. 79); but what he rebels against is the indiscriminate pyrrhichizing of iamb-words independently of group or phrase—e.g. *bouēs incursant*. In this matter there is a gulf of difference between him and Plautus.

You may say that the number of initial disyllables un-pyrrhichized is the measure of Terence's acquiescence in the new rules for a more strictly regulated quantity and of the literariness of his style. In his six plays there are only about a dozen cases of such shortening in senarii. That means that comedy has learned a new gait. 'Plus adhuc habitura gratiae si intra trimetros stetissent.'

His reputation rested on his mastery of the senarius. He was no match for Plautus as a comic librettist; and it was in the greatly increased importance of the parts written in senarii that the new conception of drama was expressed. Not only more pennyworths of senarii to that intolerable deal of libretto-verse, but the senarii differentiated from the libretto-verse, and notably in respect of the pyrrhichizing of iambs. We can no more say that Terence 'shortens' *uidē*, etc., than that Virgil 'shortens' *nisī* or *mihī*. But apart from *uidē*, *rogō*, *davī* (*Phorm.* 261, *Ad.* 311), *domī* (*Eun.* 673), *abī* (*Andr.* 255), *rogā* (*Hec.* 558), and *uidēn* (*Eun.* 836) (which even the Augustans could not proscribe), *habēn* (*ib.* 674), *abīn* (*ib.* 861), he admits at the beginning of the senarius only about a dozen exceptions to the (literary) canon of a strict quantity 'by Position'<sup>1</sup>—i.e. by convention, viz.:

SENARI, <i>Andr.</i>	95	sciās posse.	<i>Haut.</i>	803	et simūl conficiam.
initial <i>Eun.</i>	157	sorōr dictast.	<i>Phorm.</i>	352	negāt Phanium.
"	889	tamēn si pater.	"	601	patēr uenit.
<i>Ad.</i>	145	tamēn uix hu-	<i>Ad.</i>	73	studēt par referre.
		mane.	"	900	studēt facere.
<i>Eun.</i>	430	dolēt dictum.	"	118	amāt? dabitur.
"	905	adēst optume.	"	639	tacēt? cur non ludo. <sup>2</sup>
<i>Hec.</i>	409	adēst Parmeno.			

NON-SENARI, *initial*. Furthermore, in long accompanied verses, at the beginning of a verse, or at a change of speaker within the verse, the following are found:

<sup>1</sup> Of the following list it will be noted how many attest that weakness in the final *-t* of the third person, which the pre-literary Umbrian (e.g. Ernout, *Recueil*, p. 41) and the eventual Italian would lead us to suppose. Cf. Lindsay, *L.L.*, p. 528.

<sup>2</sup> I do not add *Eun.* 511, roget quis 'Quid rei tibi cum illa?' ne noram quidem, believing the Calliopian reading, 'roget quis "Quid tibi cum ea?"'

SENA

I thin  
their seve

*Andr.*  
et illas (se  
istam; bu  
indicate  
si insumas  
illum tibi  
*Phorm.* 14  
Diomedes  
sed ex fr  
group (cf

Few  
In (a  
ego inter  
Demipho  
In (a

This  
(a)  
Of  
as it is,  
reading  
Terentia  
obvious  
from the  
to say fin

(b)

Troch.	<i>Andr.</i>	261	amör, misericordia.
Iamb.	"	394	patrĩ dic te uelle.
"	"	396	dabĩt nemo.
Troch.	"	301	quid ais, Byrrhia? Datũrne illa . . .
"	<i>Eun.</i>	252	negāt quis: nego; ait: aio.
Iamb.	"	318	colör uerus, corpus solidum.
"	"	384	habēnt despīcatam ( <i>despīcatu</i> , Bentley).
"	"	569	erāt quīdam eunuchus.
"	<i>Haut.</i>	993	solēnt esse.
"	"	998	erĩt, tam facillume.
"	"	1000	senēx exit foras.
Troch.	<i>Phorm.</i>	342	priör bibas.
"	"	346	senēx adest.
"	"	546	sed parũmne est.
Iamb.	<i>Hec.</i>	202	uiris esse aduorsas.
"	"	798	refērt gratiam.
Troch.	"	527	peperit filia. Hem, tacēs?
Iamb.	"	866	adeo muttito. Placēt non fieri.

## SENARII, non-initial :

- (a) *Eun.* Prol. 8 ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas.
- (b) *Haut.* 101 tractare sed ui et uiā peruolgata patrum.
- (c) *Phorm.* 439 dicam tibi ĩmpīngam grandem. Dixi, Demipho.
- (d) *Hec.* 664 uosmet uidete iam Lachēs et tu, Pamphile.
- (e) *Ad.* Prol. 4 indicio de se ipse erĩt, uos eritis iudices.

I think these are all that remain outstanding after the rest have been referred to their several categories already treated:

*Andr.* 753 rogō—no reason why it should be lengthened (see p. 79). *Eun.* 78 et illas (see p. 73). *Eun.* 160 et istam (see pp. 72, 73). The probable cure is to read *id istam*; but the pause might justify *et istam*. *Haut.* 74 in illis exercendis. Here DB indicate a variant: they have, teste Umpfenbach, *si sumas illis in exercendis*. Read *si insumas illis exercendis*. *Haut.* 159 et illum. Read *Menedeme, et porro recte spero et illum tibi* (cf. p. 73). *Haut.* 437 in illum (cf. p. 73). *Phorm.* 126 et illos (p. 73). *Phorm.* 143 ego hinc (p. 73). *Hec.* 107 ut hōc proferam, sed ũt (see p. 73), and add Diomedes' statement (Keil I., p. 437) that the Romans punctuated before *sed*. *Ad.* 40 sed ěx fratre—the same will hold. *Ad.* 787 ita-ũt-dixi. Either a fully coalesced group (cf. *ita-me-di-ament*) or the opening of a new sentence; punctuate after *sunt*.

Few as these are, the list is still subject to abatements.

In (c) it is the special emphasis of TIBI, which shortens ĩmpīngam (cf. quid ĩnterea, ego ĩnterea). Phormio's words are: 'It will be *your* turn for a swingeing action, Demipho.'

In (e) the reading is doubtful. Bentley gave:

indicio de sese ipse erit, uos iudices.

This leaves us only three instances:

- (a) ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas (*Eun.* 8).

Of the outstanding exceptions, this alone comes from a Prologue. Surprising as it is, a quotation by St. Jerome (in Umpfenbach) establishes it for a current reading as early as Donatus. I suppose it was a Plautine or, at least, a pre-Terentian tag, quoted here from some earlier Prologue. The taunt was an extremely obvious one for rival playwrights to throw at each other in a literature of adaptations from the Greek. Indeed, one can hardly imagine that it would be left for Terence to say first. Of course the high emphasis on BONIS is a cause, just as in

nam expedit BONIS esse uobis (*Haut.* 388).

- (b) ui et uiā peruolgata patrum (*Haut.* 101).

*niā-peruolgata* may be regarded as a group—i.e. a six-syllable word. Perhaps also archaic, as the alliteration suggests.

(d) Read uosmet uidete iam, Laches, *Philumena*. The plural verb with the singular vocative puzzled some copyist, forgetful of his *uestras*, *Eure*, *domos*. *Philumena*'s name is required.

NON-SENARI, *non-initial*. Finally we come to the disyllables where shortening takes place without initial intensity:

- Troch. *Eum.* 237 'quid istuc' inquam 'ornatist?' 'Quoniam *misēr* quod habui perdidī.'  
 Iamb. " 260 ille ubi miser famelicus *uidēt* mihi esse tantum honorem.  
 " " 263 si potis est, tanquam philosophorum *habēt* disciplinae ex ipsis.  
 " " 282 ad illam. PA. Age modo: i nunc: tibi patent *forēs* hae quia istam ducis.  
 " " 284 qui mihi nunc uno digitulo *forēs*-aperis fortunatus.  
 Troch. " 943 pro-deūm-fidēm! facinus foedum . . .<sup>1</sup>  
 Iamb. " 1045 illumne qui mini *dedīt*-consilium . . .<sup>2</sup>  
 Troch. *Haut.* 176 et illam *simūl* cum nuntio . . .  
 Iamb. " 197 immo ille fuit *senēx* importunus . . .  
 " " 201 fortasse aliquantum iniquiōr *erāt* praeter . . .  
 Troch. " 388 nam expedit *bonās* esse uobis . . .  
 " *Phorm.* 516 idem hic tibi quod *bonī* promeritus fueris . . .  
 " " 532 miles dare se dixit: si mihi *priōr* tu attuleris . . .  
 Iamb. " 787 factum uolo: ac pol minus queo *uirī* culpa . . .  
 " *Hec.* 312 itidem illae mulieres sunt ferme ut pueri *leuī*-sententia.<sup>3</sup>  
 " " 580 ut nunquam *sciēs* commerui . . .  
 " " 594 dum aetatis tempus *tulīt*, perfuncta . . .  
 " *Ad.* 173 o facinus indignum! Geminabit nī *cauēs*. Ei misero mihi!  
 " " 180 responde. AE. Ante aedes non fecisse *erīt* melius hic conuicium.  
 Troch. " 618 nam ut forte hinc ad obstetricem *erāt* missa.  
 " " 960 iudico *Syrūm* fieri esse aequom . . .  
*Haut.* 338 I treat elsewhere.

A score of examples out of the six plays; and of this small total no less than one-quarter occurs in a single scene, the dialogue between Parmeno and Gnatho in *Eunuchus* 232-291, an episode of strikingly Plautine (or at least archaic) colouring, in the broadest, most popular, most *motoria* of Terence's pieces. The importance of this point is obvious.

So Terence has only about a dozen examples of abridgement in an initial disyllabic word, whereas one play (*Eunuchus*) alone can show as many *unabridged*. Now, as a specimen of Plautus' practice take the four plays *Miles*, *Most.*, *Persa*, *Pseud.* I find in these only eighteen<sup>4</sup> true cases of iambic length maintained in the initial disyllable of a sentence.

<sup>1</sup> I see no cause that should abridge *fidēm* here except the verse stresses on *deūm* and *facinus*, which means that it is an unskilful verse—or corruptly reported. Perhaps we should add one to the four recognized troch. quaternarii of Terence (*And.* 246, *Phorm.* 183, *Ad.* 158, 616) and read,

Proh deum <atque hominum fide>  
 as in *And.* 246, making a senarius of  
 <O> facinus foedum! O infelicem adulescentulum!

In the example from *Phormio* the quaternarius stands between two iambic lines.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Caecilius' *capit-consilium*.

<sup>3</sup> Comparing this with *Phorm.* 949, 'inepti uestra puerili sententia,' the reading itidem illae mulieres sunt ferme puerili sententia (D').

may commend itself; but, on the other hand, Pacuvius' (Ribb., p. 86) *brenī capite, cernice anguina, aspectu truci*, looks as if the ablative phrase representing a (Greek) compound adjective was pronounced as a group-word.

<sup>4</sup> I.e., eliminating enclitics (*Pers.* 733, *Ps.* 545, 770), groups (*Mil.* 594, *Most.* 639), the word *etiam*, which is a mere screatus indefinitely producible, and a *dabō* (*Ps.* 118) caused by a full-stop following.

That is to say, with Plautus strict (theoretical) iambus length is the exception; with Terence colloquial (slurred) abridgement is the exception—and quite rare at that. But where the matter of abridgement is not a disyllabic word, but a (theoretically) iambic group in a phrase like *quis hic loquitur*? he regularly made his characters speak the phrase as it was spoken by the 'best people,' no less than by the slurrers and gabblers. In all the six prologues there is no instance of a disyllable abridged, except the famous *Eun.* 8 (see p. 81). There are only *id isti, id esse, quod illi, ita ut facere* (init.), *magistratus, et in deterrendo* (init.), *ego interea*.

If the facts have been here correctly arranged and the inference correctly made, we shall recognize in lines (such as are detailed on p. 82) like *Phorm.* 342,

prior bibas, prior decumbas; cena dubia adponitur,

an archaic flavour, just as—even without the hint from Servius, which is not always forthcoming—we recognize a versus Ennianus or a hemistichion Ennianum in Virgil's hexameters.

JOHN S. PHILLIMORE.

THE UNIVERSITY, GLASGOW.

(I have to thank Mr. R. G. Austin and Mr. C. J. Fordyce, both of Balliol College, for assistance in preparing this paper for the press.)

### A NOTE ON THE FIRST SALLUSTIAN *SVASORIA*.

IN discussing the authorship of the first *suasoria* preserved in Cod. Vat. Lat. 3864<sup>1</sup> I said that an argument against its Sallustian origin had been found in the words 'paulo ante hoc bellum' of 4, 1. By this phrase the author marks an interval of twenty-seven years, and I suggested, as had been done before, that perhaps this is hardly the way 'in which a man still under forty would refer to so long an interval which had ended only four years before he was writing.' The elasticity of Latin words indicating number and magnitude is familiar, but by the kindness of Dr. Rice Holmes I have been reminded of a place where some of the more interesting examples have been collected. Dr. Postgate, on p. lxxiv of his edition of Lucan VIII., mentions among other Caesarian passages *B.C.* 3, 106, 1, where the few days concerned in 'Caesar paucos dies in Asia moratus' are something like three weeks; and *B.G.* 3, 20, 1, where 'paucis ante annis' dates an event which probably happened either twenty-one or twenty-two years before the time with which the narrative is concerned.<sup>2</sup> To these Dr. Holmes would add *Cic. in Cat.* 3, 1, 3, and, by way of contrast, *Caesar B.C.* 3, 25, 1. In the former the 'eruption' of Catiline on the night of November 8-9 is described by Cicero on December 3, twenty-four days later, as having occurred 'paucis ante diebus': in the latter a period of scarcely three months is 'multi menses.'

It may be worth while to put together such passages in the undoubted works of Sallust as might be quoted in support of the peccant words from the *First Suasoria*. 'Paucos post annos' in *B. Jug.* 9, 4 might be an interesting case if it were possible to believe that Sallust had any clear idea of the chronology he was trying to describe; but, in spite of the attempts at defence which have been made, 'nouissimae rediens Numantia' (10, 2) seems hopelessly inaccurate, and the result is that the meaning of 'paucos post annos' in 9, 4 remains vague. The interval may indeed be the fifteen years from 133 to 118, as some of the more recent critics have been inclined to think;

<sup>1</sup> *C.Q.* 1923, pp. 160 and 162.

(ed. 2), III., p. 107 n. 9, with references there given.

<sup>2</sup> For this vide C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule*

but it may equally well be no more than the last three years of Micipsa's life (11, 6). There is nothing remarkable about *B. Jug.* 24, 1 and 86, 4, where the length of time required for a journey from Cirta to Rome and from Rome to Utica respectively is 'pauci dies.' More noteworthy are *B. Jug.* 41, 1 and 42, 1. In the latter 'paucos post annos' means after rather more than eleven years; in the former 'paucis ante annis' carries back to a point at least thirty-six years earlier, as is shown both by the following section and by *Hist.* 1, 11-12 (Maurenbrecher).<sup>1</sup>

To the words of the *First Suasoria* with which this note began the nearest approach to a parallel is to be found in *B. Jug.* 81, 1. There a remark alleged to have been made by Jugurtha in a year which according to Meinel's dating is 107 B.C. is reported as follows—'tum sese, paulo ante Carthaginiensis, item regem Persen, post uti quisque opulentissimus uideatur, ita Romanis hostem fore.' Since Carthage was destroyed in 146, 'paulo ante' here is used to cover an interval of not less than thirty-nine years—an interval longer than that over which the same phrase stretches in the *First Suasoria*. There is this, however, to be remembered, that the more distant a period of time is from the date of the composition in which reference to it is made, the easier is it to call that period short. In *ad Caes.* 1, 4, 1, if the document is Sallustian, the end of the interval spanned by 'paulo ante' was only four years before the time of writing, whereas in the case of *B. Jug.* 81, 1 it was something like sixty-seven years ago.

The effect of these considerations seems to be definitely to weaken the case against the *First Suasoria*, so that now there is less to set against the evidence in its favour, which to me appears almost conclusive.

HUGH LAST.

<sup>1</sup> 1, 9-10 (Dietsch).

### VIRGIL'S CVLEX.

MAY I call the attention of English scholars to a remark by Professor Heinze in his review of Professor Frank's *Virgil, a Biography*, viz. that the *Culex* was a favourite present for schoolboys in Martial's time (*Mart.* 14, 185)?

How all the difficulties vanish<sup>1</sup> if we regard it as Virgil's first publication, a mere tale for a schoolboy, written to help young Octavian in the Greek Mythology class-work! A peg on which to hang this *memoria technica* had been, we may suppose, supplied to Virgil by a recent incident in Octavian's neighbourhood, the wonderful escape of a goatherd from a serpent.

Heinze rightly refuses to believe that the *Culex* and the *Ciris* can, both of them, come from the same author, at least at the same time. It is easier to believe that the *Ciris* is Gallus' Epyllium and that Virgil had a hand in its composition.

One more remark seems called for. Lucan's reference to the *Culex* (rightly explained by Professor Phillimore<sup>2</sup>), 'and my age is but a step removed from the age at which the *Culex* was begun,' is not prose but verse:

et quantum mihi restat  
ad Culicem?

It was a part of Lucan's prologue at his first recitatio.

W. M. LINDSAY.

<sup>1</sup> Just as all the difficulties in the last couplet of *Ed.* IV. vanish if we regard it as a nursery

rhyme which Virgil weaves into his poem.

<sup>2</sup> *C.Q.* April, 1917.

## THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF APVLEIVS. II.

IN my previous<sup>1</sup> article I argued that certain of the later MSS. of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, and especially those which I call Class I., are to a large extent descended from a lost copy of F, made before the rent was torn in Book VIII., and therefore before the writing of  $\phi$ ; and I inferred that it was likely that the evidence of these MSS. would prove a valuable addition to that of  $\phi$  in places where F is now illegible. In the following pages I shall prove that this hope has been fulfilled.

As a necessary preliminary I must say something of the affinities and relative values of the eight texts which I assign to Class I.—seven MSS. and the *editio princeps*. These fall into two well-marked groups:

- (a) A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, L<sub>1</sub>, V<sub>2</sub>.
- (b) E, S, N<sub>4</sub>,  $\alpha$ .

The fact that these eight texts form a single class<sup>2</sup> has already been demonstrated for part of Book VIII., and will appear at large in the course of this article. I have collected many instances of their agreement in omissions, but want of space compels me to suppress this evidence. I have already shown that Class I. has definitely felt the influence of  $\phi$ , and fresh instances will appear; but this influence is obviously secondary.

I have not completely collated any member of group (b); but I have collated much of E and  $\alpha$ , and I have checked in E and  $\alpha$  all the passages where my records of the readings of group (a) led me to re-examine the text of F and  $\phi$  at Florence. It is likely, however, that I may have missed some passages where (b) would have been more suggestive than (a); and, in any case, my re-examination of F and  $\phi$  was very much less thorough than I could have wished. Lack of time compelled me to cut down to a minimum my list of likely passages, and in some cases I accidentally noticed unrecorded readings of F, which proved that I. (a) readings, which I had not even intended to check in F, were in fact important: for instance, Class I.'s *suspiratus* in VI. 29 (151, 13), which I had meant to ignore, proved to be an original F variant. I must have missed many more.

Of the members of (a) I have completely collated only B<sub>1</sub>, which is in the British Museum. I did this at a time when I had only a few secondhand notes about A<sub>1</sub>. When I examined A<sub>1</sub>, I discovered that B<sub>1</sub> was a direct copy of it. I had not time to collate A<sub>1</sub> completely, but I checked with it the whole of my collation of B<sub>1</sub>, and I hope that I have not overlooked much of importance. The evidence that B<sub>1</sub> is a copy of A<sub>1</sub> is uniform and overwhelming. In the first place, B<sub>1</sub> (as far as I have observed) contains nothing that A<sub>1</sub> omits, but omits several things that A<sub>1</sub> contains. Further, B<sub>1</sub> repeatedly misunderstands certain of A<sub>1</sub>'s abbreviations, and it is always B<sub>1</sub> that is wrong. I will add a few striking instances of B<sub>1</sub>'s dependence on A<sub>1</sub>: I. 20 (18, 25) *mira et paene infecta* FE $\alpha$ , *mira et <sup>pene</sup> forte infecta* A<sub>1</sub>, *mira et pene forte infecta* B<sub>1</sub> L<sub>1</sub>. VIII. 1 (176, 21) *charite* F  $\alpha$  L<sub>1</sub>, *carithe* E, *charise*<sup>4</sup> A<sub>1</sub>, *chariset* B<sub>1</sub>. XI. 26 (287, 28) *templi* FE $\alpha$ , *templo*<sup>5</sup> A<sub>1</sub>, *templio* B<sub>1</sub>.

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Quart.* XVIII. 27-42.

<sup>2</sup> Butler (*Apologia* 1914) noted the close connexion in *Apol.* and *Flor.* between A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, L<sub>1</sub>,

and V<sub>2</sub>, and stated that these four, and also E, were not much indebted to  $\phi$ .

There is an interesting group of passages in which A<sub>1</sub> omits a word or phrase present in F, but leaves a gap to indicate the omission. I have noted seven instances: I. 23 (21, 12) *ecce*, IV. 3 (77, 6) *nidoris*, V. 26 (123, 21) *prius*, VII. 11 (162, 14) *hircum*, XI. 21 (283, 2) *numero*, XI. 22 (284, 19) *capreolatimque condensis*, XI. 30 (290, 30) (*sa*) *cerdoti meo* (*sa* is not omitted). B<sub>1</sub> omits all these words and phrases, but, except in the last case, where *sa* is obviously incomplete, it leaves no gaps. It happens that all these words and phrases are perfectly legible in both F and  $\phi$  to-day, and it therefore seems obvious that A<sub>1</sub> is derived, directly or indirectly, from a partially illegible exemplar, which was neither F nor  $\phi$ . A MS. may, of course, be illegible for many reasons, but a common explanation is age and fading ink. Lowe<sup>1</sup> has pointed out that Beneventan MSS. written at Monte Cassino in the eleventh century were peculiarly liable to fade quickly (as F has often faded), and this feature of A<sub>1</sub> is favourable, so far as it goes, to my hypothesis that Class I. is derived from a copy of F made at Monte Cassino before  $\phi$  was written. The fact that B<sub>1</sub> is a copy of A<sub>1</sub> makes it unnecessary, as a rule,<sup>2</sup> to quote B<sub>1</sub>. I may add that my identification of B<sub>1</sub> with the Pithoeanus of Oudendorp and Hildebrand is certain. I will not waste space in proving it.

The values of L<sub>1</sub> and V<sub>2</sub> I found at first difficult to estimate, for they were the first members of Class I. that I met, and the least respectable: the matter is not really obscure. V<sub>2</sub> has been so drastically revised (with the help of II. and IV.) that its original readings are often irrecoverable. These original readings usually agree with I. (a), and especially with A<sub>1</sub>, with which it shares many striking omissions: but even its untouched text has been influenced by II. and IV., and probably also by  $\phi$  direct. It is a child of I., but contaminated, and, like III., only occasionally valuable. L<sub>1</sub> (Boccaccio's autograph) is in good condition, and has suffered little from later correctors. It is fundamentally I., and it agrees so often with B<sub>1</sub>, where B<sub>1</sub> deserts A<sub>1</sub>, that I feel sure that B<sub>1</sub> is among its ancestors. It is clear, however, that between B<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>1</sub> stood some MS., now lost, which was freely corrected and emended with the help of other MSS., one of which was probably  $\phi$ . As instances of L<sub>1</sub>'s agreement with B<sub>1</sub>, I may refer to I. 20 (18, 25) already quoted, where L<sub>1</sub> copies B<sub>1</sub>'s *pene forte*, and to VII. 1 (154, 5), where for *Vt primum* (the opening of the book) A<sub>1</sub> has *t primum* (leaving a gap for illumination), B<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>1</sub> *At primum*: and to L<sub>1</sub>'s reproduction of B<sub>1</sub>'s corruptions in V. 1 (104, 9) *figurant*, VI. 10 (136, 1) *suntque*, VII. 27 (175, 8) *delectabilem*: and of B<sub>1</sub>'s omissions of *miscuit* in VII. 7 (159, 13), and *suus* in VIII. 22 (194, 2), both of which words are present in A<sub>1</sub>. Where L<sub>1</sub> agrees with A<sub>1</sub> against B<sub>1</sub>, this can always (I think) be explained as either a common-sense correction or a loan from MSS. of other classes. Such borrowing must also explain the small minority of passages where L<sub>1</sub> does not share omissions common to A<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>1</sub>, such as *et domuitionis anxiae et spoliationis diuturnae* in I. 7 (7, 11), and also L<sub>1</sub>'s occasional participation in the peculiar omissions of other classes: for instance, in the omission of *officiosus roncis* in I. 9 (9, 3), words omitted by V<sub>2</sub> and by II., III., and IV., but not by A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>,  $\alpha$ , E, or S (the words are corrupt in both F *rontis* and  $\phi$  *ratis*: hence, probably, the omissions. A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub> have *rontis*). Such obedient removal of good readings is a common phenomenon. For instance, in E a later hand has crossed out *ex forma* in VII. 25 (173, 3) because  $\phi$  had dropped it; and in VIII. 5 (180, 7) V<sub>2</sub>'s reviser has cancelled *toto ergo*, in imitation of II. An excellent instance of the contamination of L<sub>1</sub>'s ancestry is II. 23 and 24 (44, 14), where F and  $\phi$  read *comparas*. *Ic placito* (probably a corruption of *compara*. *Sic placito*). Here II., III., and IV. have *comparas*. *Quo placito*, but A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, E,  $\alpha$ , read *comparas*. *Hic placito*. In L<sub>1</sub> we find *comparas*.

<sup>1</sup> *The Beneventan Script*, p. 286.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this article the ascription of a reading to A<sub>1</sub> implies its presence in B<sub>1</sub> also, unless the contrary is stated.

*Hic quo p*  
combined  
(55, 23),  
line of  
(the seco  
both rea  
which I

From  
The  
are all  
N<sub>4</sub> may  
I shall  
S, E, an  
the imm  
are deep  
which it  
apparen  
a repres  
not thin

To  
(i.) pecu  
very few  
latter:

(i.)  
E,  $\alpha$ , S  
by A<sub>1</sub>,  
V. 20 (1  
present  
by A<sub>1</sub>,  
(ii.)

present  
(191, 2  
 $\alpha$  omits  
VIII.  
present  
(iii)  
divided  
(187, 1

(iv)  
In

But ne  
sometim  
remark  
Class I

I.  
the ma  
fuisse  
clear t  
u of u  
almost  
erasur  
the ma

*Hic quo placito.* V2 follows the crowd with *comparas.* *Quo placito.* Sometimes L1 combines the readings of F and  $\phi$ , where A1 agrees with F: for instance, in III. 5 (55, 23), which I quote below, and in IV. 8 (80, 13), where  $\phi$ , by dropping an entire line of F (fol. 139b, col. a, l. 13), *ministerium . . . pul*, has been saddled with *mitis* (the second half of *pulmentis*) and has copied it as *mitis* (*mensis*). Here L1 and V2 both read *pulmentis mensis*, but there is no trace of *mensis* in the eighteen other MSS. which I have checked.

From all this it is clear that L1, like V2, is comparatively unimportant.

The character of group (b) is more puzzling. The extant members of the group are all late, and their internal relationships are obscure. I have already said that N4 may be derived from a printed source, and that I know very few of its readings: I shall ignore it here. Of S also, as I have said, I know comparatively little. S, E, and  $\alpha$  are very closely connected, but it is clear that neither S nor E represents the immediate source of  $\alpha$ . All three texts agree in being highly sophisticated: they are deeply vitiated by emendation. E shows a great many omissions, a minority of which it shares with A1, but  $\alpha$  is singularly free from them. I suspect that this apparent superiority is largely due to the activities of a reviser: it is possible that  $\alpha$  represents more than one MS. used simultaneously by the first printers, but I do not think this likely.

To illustrate the character of (b) I give here a few instances of omissions (i.) peculiar to (a); (ii.) shared by (a) and E; (iii.) peculiar to E. I have noticed very few omissions peculiar to (b) or peculiar to  $\alpha$ , but I give one instance of the latter:

(i.) Omissions peculiar to (a): I. 14 (13, 7) *nudus* omitted by A1, L1, present in E,  $\alpha$ , S (also in V2). III. 12 (61, 14 to 16) *manibus . . . raptim* inclusive. Omitted by A1, present in E,  $\alpha$ . IV. 28 (96, 16) *quadam* omitted by A1, L1, present in E,  $\alpha$ . V. 20 (118, 8 to 10) *quoniam nos . . . ullum ante* inclusive. Omitted by A1, L1, V2, present in E,  $\alpha$ . VIII. 22 (194, 9 to 11) *infantulumque . . . funiculo nectit*. Omitted by A1, L1, V2, present in E,  $\alpha$ .

(ii.) Omissions shared by (a) and E: I. 18 (16, 17) *me* omitted by A1, L1, V2, E, present in  $\alpha$ . V. 19 (118, 6) *mulieres* omitted by A1, E, present in  $\alpha$ . VIII. 18 (191, 20 and 21) *ubi placuit . . . refectui* inclusive. Omitted by A1, L1, V2, E;  $\alpha$  omits only *refectui*: this partial omission suggests the hand of a reviser in  $\alpha$ . VIII. 19 (192, 6 to 8) *quae uox . . . incussit* inclusive. Omitted by A1, V2, E, present in  $\alpha$ .

(iii.) Omissions peculiar to E: III. 10 (59, 20) *observatis uie solitudinibus* (wrongly divided in F). V. 25 (122, 21 and 22) *tunc forte . . . complexus* inclusive. VIII. 13 (187, 17) *funestum*. VIII. 15 (188, 15) *infantulos et mulieres gerebamus*.

(iv.) Omission peculiar to  $\alpha$ : III. 2 (52, 25) *occipiunt*.

In general (a) is decidedly more useful than (b), for it is much less sophisticated. But neither source can be ignored: for sometimes (b) is more honest than (a), and sometimes each has preserved part of the truth. I will conclude these preliminary remarks by quoting one passage which illustrates my general thesis of the value of Class I., and at the same time displays the peculiar features of the chief MSS.

I. 5 (4, 20) *nec\*uo\*s ulterius dubitabit* F (the original hand has added *nec uos* in the margin). F's present text is due to a later corrector, and Helm says 'uidetur fuisse *ne quas*.' This explanation, however, is untenable, as under the glass there are clear traces of the upper and lower strokes of a preceding Beneventan *t* joining the *u* of *uo\*s*. In F's hand *q* is never connected with a following *u*. It is therefore almost certain that F's text read *ne tuas* (the rest of Helm's interpretation of the erasures is convincing). The correction *nec uos*, which F's original scribe added in the margin, was adopted by  $\phi$ , and is read by II., IV., and part of III.

In I. we find:

(a) *ne tua ulterius dubietatis* A1, B1; *ne tu ulterius dubitabis* L1.

(b) *ne et uos ulterius dubitetis* E, α.

It looks as if (a) at least, and probably also (b), were derived from a MS. in which F's marginal variant had been overlooked, but where a first timid attempt was made to emend F's text, by giving a construction to *ne*: something like—

*ne tuas ulterius dubitabitis.*

The scribe of (a) could make nothing of this: he dropped the *s* of *tuas* (perhaps unconsciously), and misinterpreted the correction of *dubitabitis*. The cleverer (b) understood the correction of *dubitabitis* and emended *ne tuas* to *ne et uos*. L1's reading looks like an attempt to emend B1's. Of III., B2 reads *nec uos*, with F's margin and φ, but N2 and V7 read *ne uos ulterius dubitetis*, which looks like a simplification of (b)'s reading.

It was the persistent presence of *t* before *u* in I. that led me to re-examine this passage in F (on my first inspection I had accepted Helm's plausible view), and to discover the horizontal strokes of the erased *t*. F's marginal correction should no doubt be accepted: Helm (*Florida*, p. xliii) has collected over thirty instances of the interchange of *c* and *t* in F.

This passage brings me to the most important part of my work: the proof (by selected instances) that the MSS. of Class I. have in fact preserved F's original readings, or traces of them, in a large number of passages where they are now either illegible or very difficult to decipher: this list might be much enlarged from the materials which I have collected, but lack of space compels me to give only a few. My new evidence sometimes confirms and sometimes refutes previous students' interpretations of F. In this section I shall distinguish (A) original readings in the body of F's text, and (B) original or very early variants in F, whether intralinear or marginal—a type of reading whose value, in F, is universally recognized, and for which, as I shall show, Class I. has a marked liking. I shall note in each case the readings of φ, and of the other Classes, so far as I know them. Helm's report of F is given in each case in square brackets: where the word is simply printed in his text, without comment, I place 'Helm' after the word. Where he has a critical note I prefix 'Helm,' and then give his note<sup>1</sup> entire, including his method of quoting φ, which he thus explains: 'Nota (φ) postposita indicat codicem φ testem esse lectionis codicis F, sed tantum eius quae antecedit.' I treat other editors on the same principle when I refer to them, which I seldom do unless they are better than Helm. If they simply confirm my contradiction of Helm, I add their names in square brackets after my own report of F or φ, using the abbreviations 'Hild.' for Hildebrand (1842), 'Eyss.' for Eyssenhardt (1869), and 'Vliet' for van der Vliet (1897). For instance: 'I. 1 (1, 9) [*Linguam* Helm]. *linguam* F [Hild.]' means that Helm prints *linguam* without comment, but that F in fact reads *linguam*: and that this fact was recorded by Hildebrand, but by no subsequent editor. Throughout the rest of this article a dagger is affixed to all passages where I report new readings which seem to deserve consideration on their intrinsic merits: new readings, I mean, which may perhaps preserve or suggest what Apuleius wrote. It is to be assumed throughout that B1 agrees with A1, unless the contrary is stated. Lack of space makes it impossible to enumerate in each case the MSS. of each Class which I have checked, but, unless a special note is added, 'Class II.' always includes at least B3, and 'Class III.' at least B2. I do not always notice trivial variations of spelling, contractions, etc., unless they seem to have some importance: and I usually ignore later corrections of MSS. (many of which seem to come from α and other early printed texts). For the Beneventan abbreviation of final *m*, I sometimes substitute ~, as Helm does. The symbol (L2), occasionally added to 'φ,' means that I have a record

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of clearness, I have slightly modified the punctuation of some of these notes.

showing th  
confirm my  
where Clas  
have been  
even a sele  
from Class  
from print  
readings of  
seldom kno  
reading of I

I. 1 (1,  
erased): co  
Helm] ling  
erased (inqu  
atidem F φ)  
Eyss. 'me\*  
by 'f' Eyss  
hand]. Ey  
me, and tha  
In φ, ui is  
have: merbi  
[si quis Hel  
si quis E II.  
lat. Gramm.,  
Hypatae qua  
As Helm, b  
(E illegible)  
cuncte Thessa  
caseum recent  
but caseum r  
variant foist  
from I. Pr  
though in t  
192, 2) F re  
(8, 20) [teme  
in F a fullst  
E α II. III  
Beroald.' B  
Beroaldus' e  
obseno φ (bu  
B3, but per  
me F (but al  
me II. III. I  
Wölflin, dis  
true parallel  
instance of t  
esurit et sitit)  
magistro Hel  
and magistro  
ciudadstio magi

showing that L2's revised readings, which were copied from  $\phi$  in the year 1425, confirm my interpretation of  $\phi$ . Some of the passages which I include are cases where Class I. has preserved readings which are still perfectly legible in F or  $\phi$ , but have been merely misreported by Helm. Lack of space has compelled me to omit even a selection of the passages in which I have noted (without help or confirmation from Class I.) errors in Helm's report of F or  $\phi$ . Where I know a MS. reading only from printed sources, I add an asterisk (e.g. S\*,  $\delta^*$ ). I am often ignorant of the readings of any MS. of Class IV. (of which there is no example in England), and I seldom know the readings of all MSS. of any Class. If I feel any doubt about the reading of F or any other MS., I always say so.

## (A) READINGS IN THE BODY OF F'S TEXT.

I. 1 (1, 1) [*conseriam* Helm] *conseriam* F  $\phi$  (*ri* ligature in each case partially erased): *conseriam* A1 (E illegible): *conseram*  $\alpha$  L1 II. III. IV. I1 (1, 9) [*linguam* Helm] *linguam* F [Hild], \**inquam*  $\phi$  [Vliet], *l* having been crossed out, and then erased (*inquam* L2): *linguam* A1 (E illegible), *inquam*  $\alpha$  (followed by *in Atthide*, for *atidem* F  $\phi$ ): *linguam* II. III. IV. I. 1 (1, 10) [Helm '*me/rui* ( $\phi$ ) *ru* in ras. ead. m.' Eyss. '*me\*/rui* (in ras. vid. fuisse *r*, pro *ru* fuisse *h* vel *b*, in F  $\dagger$  *merui* add. *f*, *merui*  $\phi$ ': by '*f*' Eyss. means what he calls F's 'second hand,' which is not really a single hand]. Eyss. is right about F, except that it is uncertain *what* letter is erased after *me*, and that the *second* stroke of the *u* is original. F therefore had *me(r)/bii* (or *hii*). In  $\phi$ , *ui* is rewritten in erasure, and there is a later note *p merui*. The later MSS. have: *merbii* A1 E, *inuenui* II. (but B3 *menii*?), *merui*  $\alpha$  L1 III. IV.  $\dagger$ I. 3 (3, 10) [*si quis* Helm], *siq* F  $\phi$ , but *s* certainly later in  $\phi$ , probably later in F: *si qui* A1  $\alpha$ : *si quis* E II. III. IV. This *si qui* may well be right: see Kühner-Holzweissig, *Ausf. lat. Gramm.*, 1912, p. 614a. I. 5 (4, 20) see above, p. 87. I. 5 (5, 6) [*comperto itaque Hypatae quae ciuitas cunctae Thessaliae antepollet caseum recens . . . distrahi, etc.* Helm]. As Helm, but *caseus* F [Hild.]  $\phi$  (L2). Other MSS. have: as F (with *caseus*), A1 (E illegible): as F, but *esset* inserted before *caseus*,  $\alpha$ : *comperto itaque Hypate ciuitatis cuncte Thessalie antepollere caseum recentem . . . distrahi, etc.*, L1 V2 II.: as F, but *uel caseum recentem* (corrupted by N2 L3 to *ut caseum recentem*) III. (except B2): as F, but *caseum recentem* B2 IV. The *uel caseum recentem* of III. is clearly a marginal variant foisted into the text, and supports the view that III. was originally derived from I. Probably Apuleius wrote *caseum recens*, for which there are good parallels, though in the only other passage of *Met.* where the gender is shown (VIII. 19 = 192, 2) F reads *caseum recentem*. There is no parallel for *caseus* as a neuter. I. 9 (8, 20) [*temerasset* Helm] *temerasset* F  $\phi$ , but in each case final *t* almost certainly later: in F a fullstop seems to have been erased after the word: *temerasse* A1: *temerasset* E  $\alpha$  II. III. IV.  $\dagger$ I. 9 (9, 7) [Helm '*obseno*.  $\phi$ , *obseno* (m. rec. add. *imūdo*) em. Beroald.' Eyss. '*obseno* F  $\phi$  (*sed no* in F fere *evanuerunt*']. All editors adopt Beroaldus' emendation *obsepto*. The MSS. in fact have: *obseto* F (almost certain), *obseno*  $\phi$  (but  $\epsilon$  is very late): *obseto* A1 L1 E  $\alpha$ : II. III. IV. *obseno* or *obseno*. (*obsteto* B3, but perhaps not original).  $\dagger$ I. 15 (14, 13) [*Cerberum . . . esurientem me* Helm] *me* F (but almost certainly by erasure from *mei*), *mei*  $\phi$  [Vliet, Helm]: *mei* A1 E  $\alpha$ : *me* II. III. IV. The reading *mei* is almost certainly right, though Helm prints *me*. Wölfflin, discussing the usages of *esurio*, in *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* I. 411 and 579, quotes no true parallel for such an accusative as *me* earlier than Ambrosius, but gives one instance of the genitive—and that is from Apuleius (*de deo Socr.* 22 *beatitudinis . . . esurit et sitit*). Wölfflin considers this genitive a graecism. I. 24 (22, 15) [*cum adstio magistro* Helm] Editors assume that a proper name has been corrupted between *cum*  $\alpha$  and *magistro*: Helm prints Seyffert's '*cum* a *Clytio magistro*.' The MSS. have: *cūadstio magistro* F  $\phi$  (but the — in each is due to a later hand): *cūastio magistro* A1,

*eustasio magistro* B<sub>1</sub> E (and L<sub>5</sub> of IV.): *e Vastio magistro* a: *cum magistro*, a *magistro*, or *cum a magistro* II. III. IV. †II. 12 (35, 4) [*in uulgus* Helm] *in uulgum* F φ (changed in F to *uulgus* by a late hand): *in uulgus* A<sub>1</sub> L<sub>1</sub> E a: *in uulgus* II. III. IV. *uulgum* may well be right (cf. Kühner-Holzweissig, p. 471). †II. 15 (37, 4) [*eiusque* Helm]. *eius qui* F φ: *eius qui* A<sub>1</sub> (E illegible), *eiusque* a: *eius* L<sub>1</sub> II. III. I mark this passage with † because, though *eius qui* cannot be right as it stands, the received text involves the further change of F's immediately preceding *uespera* to *uesperae*, and the possibility of deeper corruption ought to be considered; but I think the received text is right. †II. 21 (42, 12) [*ad instar oratorum* Helm] *ad instar oratorium* F [Hild.] φ: *ad instar oratorium* A<sub>1</sub> V<sub>2</sub> E: *ad instar oratorum* a II. III. IV. Conceivably *oratorium* may be defensible: cf. Wölfflin in *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* II. 581 (a reference which I owe to Dr. Postgate). II. 26 (46, 14) [*requirit actorem* Helm] *requiri cactorem* F [Hild.] φ: *requiri cactorem* A<sub>1</sub>, *requiri coctorem* B<sub>1</sub> L<sub>1</sub>, *requirit cactorem* E, *requirit autorem* a: *requirit actorem* V<sub>2</sub> II. III. IV. (except L<sub>5</sub> *ayctorem*). †II. 30 (49, 19) [*dabo . . . documenta: perlucide quod prorsus alius nemo cognominari indicabo* Helm]. As Helm, but *perlucide* (by erasure from *perlucid&*) F φ. Other MSS. of all classes have *perlucida. et*. For this compare IX. 5 (214, 11), where F has *sequestr&* [Hild., Eyss., Vliet, Helm], and all editors, from a to Helm, read *sequestra et*. Probably we should here read *documenta perlucida et*. †III. 11 (60, 15) [Helm 'ere (ni fallor, fuit a) st\*st& (postquam scribere coepit st&, librar. induxit et iterum scrips.). φ, e\*re (eras. a ?) st\*\*& (vid. fuisse st&st&)]. F and φ are both here very difficult: but I feel almost sure that each had (*et ut*) *i ea re stas & (imago tua decreuit)*: the words in brackets are not disputed. Other MSS.: *et ut in ea restes: et imago* E a, *et ut mea restis & ymago* A<sub>1</sub> (so B<sub>1</sub>, but *testis*): *et ut in ere stet imago* L<sub>1</sub> II. III. Second Junctine (1522). My readings favour Vliet's conjecture *staret* against the usual *stet* (adopted by Helm): in F, as Helm remarks (*Flor.*, p. xlv), s and r are very often interchanged: Helm quotes over thirty instances: *et ut in aere* must, in any case, be the right correction. †III. 29 (74, 7) [*foena rodebam* Helm]. *foena rodebam*; (= *rodebamus*) F, *foena rodebam* φ, *f. rodebamus* E a, *f. remordebam* A<sub>1</sub> B<sub>1</sub>, *f. remordebam* L<sub>1</sub>: *f. rodebamus* II.: *f. rodebam* III. There is a possibility that the plural is right, and the preceding words corrupt. The sentence runs *tunc igitur a rosis et quidem necessario temperavi et casum praesentem tolerans in asini faciem foena rodebamus*. The phrase *in asini faciem* is rather odd. Hand (*Tursellinus* III., p. 324) quotes the phrase with the comment 'Apuleius more suo barbaro.' The party includes a second ass, as well as Lucius' horse. †IV. 3 (76, 16) [*eiulabili* Helm] *eiulabili* F (but changed from *ululabili* by a later hand), *ululabili* φ [Hild.]: *ululabili* A<sub>1</sub> E a: *eiulabili* II. III. Apuleius has *ululabilis* twice, V. 7 (108, 13), X. 5 (240, 7), but *eiulabilis* never. †IV. 10 (82, 3) [*qua clauis immit-tendae foramen patebat* Helm] *clauis* (s erased) F, *clani* φ: *clauis* A<sub>1</sub> E a: *clauis* II. III. IV. A<sub>1</sub>, in particular, is very liable to omit or insert final s without any reason, but the evidence of I, here led me to detect F's erasure. This genitive may perhaps be right: cf. e.g. Caesar B.G. IV. 17 *si arborum trunci siue naues deiciendi operis essent a barbaris missae*. IV. 25 (94, 2) [*afflictare sese* Helm] *afflictaret sese* F (et written &, and partially erased), *adfflictaret sese* φ: *afflictaret sese* A<sub>1</sub> L<sub>1</sub> III., *afflictare sese* E a II. †IV. 25 (94, 11) [Helm 'replicar& (pli al. m. in ras. scrips., sed id. mihi vid. fuisse, non fuit fri). φ, *refricaret*']. *refricaret* (altered by another hand to *replicaret*) F [Hild., Vliet]: this is certain, despite Helm—the top of the unmistakable *ri* ligature remains. *refricaret* φ. Other MSS.: *refricaret* A<sub>1</sub> L<sub>1</sub> V<sub>2</sub> E a, and N<sub>2</sub> V<sub>7</sub> of III. (each with *replicaret* as a variant by the first hand), and V<sub>3</sub> of IV.: *replicaret* II. (with substitution of *illicitas* for *licentiosas*), B<sub>2</sub> of III., V<sub>5</sub> of IV. The phrase *lamentationes licentiosas reflicaret* is idiomatic and clearly right. †IV. 33 (100, 21) [Helm 'excelsi\* (eras. s) vid. fuisse scopulor existe; m. rec. eraso rex eff. subsiste (restituerat Luetj). φ, *scopulo existe*']. I think that Helm's account of F is right, except that F had at first *excelsis copulor*; but the r of *copulor* is uncertain, and what

stood between Luetjohann and right

Other MSS. with variant but N<sub>2</sub>'s *res* the pure I (110, 24) [H add.]. J. M. following w *faciem*. Oth *laboriosam* a †V. 13 (113 antea a pr. repetitum . φ, *deuote can* the rest see (based, I thi I do not thi ment shows enough to fi (correctly re slightly pref B<sub>1</sub>, *deuote di* N<sub>3</sub> V<sub>6</sub> of II only by I.: l or *dicatreque* preserved (d (iii.) stupidly *dicatreque* (E gives *deuotat* nuptis F [Hil [Helm 'mina non posset, corr. *potantes*. the nature o V<sub>2</sub> S, *praem* N<sub>2</sub> of III., n that F had reading. Th waterfall gua waters thems et 'Fuge' et ' n or u ambig commentus ob copia.' It is read *nolescentes*, less': if so, th

<sup>1</sup> Apulei *Psych.* Michaelis, Lips.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps F I

stood between *copulor* and *iste* is guess-work.  $\phi$  has *excelsi scopulo existe* (not *exsiste*). Luetjohann's reading of this oracular hexameter (adopted by all editors) is clearly right

*montis in excelsi scopulo, rex, siste puellam.*

Other MSS.: *desiste* A1 E  $\alpha$  S: *subsiste* L1 V2 II. IV.: *subsiste* B2 V7 of III. (V7 with variant *desiste*): *resiste* N2 of III. Possibly all these readings are guess-work, but N2's *resiste* may well preserve the genuine tradition of I., emended *metri gratia* in the pure I. MSS. to *desiste*. If so, it strongly supports Luetjohann.  $\dagger$ V. 10 (110, 24) [Helm 'medice\* (poster. e in ras. ex ae vel a&, ut vid.).  $\phi$ , *medicā* & (— al. m. add.)']. Measurement of the erasure shows that there is room in F before the following word *laboriosam* for *ae*, but not for *a&*: F therefore read *medicaelaboriosam faciem*. Other MSS.: *medica* | *elaboriosam* A1, *medica elaboriosam* B1 L1 E, *medice laboriosam*  $\alpha$  II.; *medice* & *laboriosam* V7 of III., *medicē & laboriosam* B2 of III.  $\dagger$ V. 13 (113, 25 and 114, 1) [Helm 'deuotē \*\*\*\*\* (eras. quinque vel septem litt. antea a pr. m. induct., quarum prima fuit *d*; mihi ipsum *deuotē* eras. vid. falso repetitum . . .; nihil in mg.; m. recentissim. supra lin. pessime scrips. *careq*;  $\phi$ , *deuote careq*;']. I agree with Helm that *d* is the first letter of the erased word: the rest seems absolutely illegible, and I cannot agree with Michaelis<sup>1</sup> statement (based, I think, on correspondence with Rostagno) that the word did not end with *q*; I do not think that the line crossing the word out is due to the first hand. Measurement shows that the simple repetition of *deuotē* (first suggested by Eyss.) is not long enough to fill the gap, and Wilmanns' suggestion *deuoteque* is not plausible.  $\phi$ 's text (correctly reported by Helm) is untouched. The late scrawl in F is illegible: I slightly prefer Michaelis' report of it as *dicataque*. Other MSS.: *deuote dictareque* A1 B1, *deuote dicataque* E  $\alpha$  S\*: *deuote* (alone) B3 O N1 of II.: *deuote careque* L1 V2 of I., N3 V6 of II., III. It is difficult to doubt that *dicataque* is the true reading, preserved only by I.: but I strongly suspect that F had some such corruption of it as *dictareque*<sup>2</sup> or *dicatrequē*. This hypothesis fits all the facts: the corruption was (i.) faithfully preserved (A1), (ii.) cut out as meaningless (B3, etc., and some corrector of F), (iii.) stupidly emended to *careque* (*dictareque*) ( $\phi$ , etc.), (iv.) cleverly emended to *dicataque* (E  $\alpha$  S\*). Either *dicataque* or *dictareque* will fit F's gap: Helm wrongly gives *deuotae dicataque* as Wower's emendation. V. 26 (124, 9) [*nuptiis* Helm] *nuptis* F [Hild., Michael.]  $\phi$  [Hild.], *nuptis* E: *nuptiis* A1  $\alpha$  II. III.  $\dagger$ VI. 15 (140, 7) [Helm 'minantes (min refict.; pr. litt. vid.  $\bar{p}$ , tertia potius *t* quam *n* fuisse).  $\phi$  cum legere non posset, primo duar. litt. spatio relicto . . . uantes aut . . . nantes, deinde al. m. corr. *potantes*']. I agree with Helm, except that even the initial  $\bar{p}$  is doubtful, and the nature of the third letter pure guess-work. Other MSS.: *praeminantes* A1 E  $\alpha$  V2 S, *praeminentes* L2: *mirantes* or *minantes* II.: *nutantes* B2 of III., *plimivantes* (?) N2 of III., *mirantes* V7  $\delta$  of III.: *potantes* V3 of IV., *praeminantes* L5 of IV. I believe that F had *praeminantes*, for which there is just room, and that<sup>3</sup> this is the true reading. The passage describes the eagle fetching water for Psyche from a deadly waterfall guarded by sleepless dragons. When Psyche had tried to fill her urn, the waters themselves had shouted '*Discede*' et '*Quid facis?* Vide' et '*Quid agis?* Caue' et '*Fuge*' et '*Peribis*'. The eagle flies between the dragons, and '*noles*' (or *uolentes*—*n* or *u* ambiguous, as Helm says) *aquas et, ut abiret innoxius*  $\dagger$ *praeminantes*  $\dagger$ *excipit, commentus ob iussum Veneris petere eique se praeministrare, quare paulo facilius adeundi fuit copia.* It is clear from *paulo* that the waters are still grudging, and I should therefore read *noles*, not *uolentes*. I suspect that *innoxius* means not 'unharmful' but 'guiltless': if so, the phrase recalls Martial IV. 30, 1, *Baiano procul a lacu monemus | piscator*

<sup>1</sup> Apulei *Psyche et Cupido* rec. Jahn<sup>5</sup> cur. Ad. Michaelis, Lips. 1905.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps F had *dicareque*.

<sup>3</sup> After coming to this conclusion, I found that Michaelis (*op. cit.*) also reads *praeminantes*, with *noles*.

*fuge, ne nocens recedas.* The word *praeminor* suggests the sort of language which the waters had previously used to Psyche. Apuleius uses *praeminor* twice in the *Met.* (V. 19 = 118, 1, and VIII. 21 = 193, 17, where F corruptly reads *praeminebatur*). Most conjectures assume that the waters are *volentes*: e.g. Helm *praestantes*, Bluemner *permittentes*. †VI. 17 (141, 12) [*'quid te' inquit 'praecipitem, o misella, quaeris extinguere?' Helm]  $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\tau\bar{\epsilon}$  o F, but almost certainly altered from  $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\tau\iota$  o (from my notes I think that the ligature used was that for unassibilated *ti*, but I am not sure),  $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\tau\bar{\epsilon}$  o  $\phi$ : *praecipitio* (misella) A1 E  $\alpha$ : *praecipitem* o (misella) II. III. Apuleius likes *praecipitium*: cf. especially V. 25 (123, 5), where Pan says to Psyche '*nec te rursus praecipitio . . . perimas.*' †VI. 18 (142, 8) [*nec Charon . . . quicquam gratuito facit, set moriens pauper, etc., Helm] facit & F  $\phi$ . [So all editors, without comment, up to and including Hild.: Eyss. says 's& sic F,' and Vliet copies his note. Michaelis (1905) printed *facit et* without comment]. *facit et* MSS. of all classes. The reading *facit et* is perfectly satisfactory. †VI. 25 (147, 16) [Helm '*trepidatione festinabant* ( $\phi$ ) in ras. al. m.; quid fuerit, non liquet']. I can add to Helm only that F's original reading had a *ti* ligature at about the same point as that of the rewritten *trepidatione*, and that the last letter was *t*. I failed to check  $\phi$ . *trepidatione festinabant* A1  $\alpha$  II. III., *festinatione trepidabant* E. It seems possible that E has preserved the true reading: Apuleius often uses both the nouns and both the verbs. †VI. 28 (150, 13) [Helm '*monilib*; refict.; fueritne idem, non liquet.  $\phi$ , *pectinabo* (in lac. postea add. ead. m)']. F's *monilib*; is a late poor straggling affair.  $\phi$ 's *pectinabo* is certainly due to a later hand, which formed the letters differently: the same hand which added *inaulatum* in  $\phi$ 's lacuna a few words later. I shall discuss this hand under the next passage: it is not the hand which supplemented the rent passages in Book VIII. Other MSS.: *perpolibo* A1 L1 V2 E  $\alpha$ : *monilibus* V6 L6 N3 O B3 of II., *pectinabo monilibus* V1 N1 of II.: *perpolibo* B2 of III., *perpolibo monilibus* N2 V7 L3 of III.: *pectinabo* V5 of IV., *perpolibo* L5 of IV. There are clearly three traditions: *perpolibo* I. III., *monilibus* II., *pectinabo*  $\phi$ 's supplementer and IV., derived therefrom. Everything points to *perpolibo* as the true reading: it makes excellent sense, and, if partially effaced, might be conjecturally remade as *monilibus* (a word which occurs earlier in the sentence), since both words end with the syllable *lib*, followed by a single letter or abbreviation. Apuleius uses *perpolio* in *Met.* IX. 16 (279, 3). †VI. 30 (151, 27 to 152, 4). This is a difficult passage, and Helm is misleading: from *laruasque* (151, 27) to *loro* (152, 4) inclusive, F (as Vliet rightly stated) is entirely rewritten by a heavy hand which completely obscures the original text: indeed, apart from one marginal variant, mentioned below, only *one* original letter is still distinguishable, the *a* which corresponds with the final *a* of the rewritten *puella* in 152, 1. Vliet was also right in saying that in  $\phi$  the whole passage has been added in a lacuna by a later hand: it is the same hand, not very good at Beneventan, which added *pectinabo* and *inaulatum* in 150, 13, *nucleos* in 150, 16, and many unrecorded phrases elsewhere, often inaccurate readings of F (e.g. VI. 17 = 141, 14, *temere incumbis*, in a lacuna, for F's *temere succumbis*): we shall meet this hand and its inaccuracies again in VIII. 6 (180, 24), discussed below. The precise limits of F's illegibility, and of  $\phi$ 's lacuna, are as stated above (Vliet is not quite accurate):  $\phi$ 's supplement ends with *loro*—(sic, at the end of a line). Helm's note '*Vlietii adnotatio de lac. in  $\phi$  prorsus perversa*' is itself perverse. F, as rewritten, runs thus (I omit the first two or three words): '*at tu, probissima puella, parentes tuos interuivere properabas? sed nos et solitudini tuae praesidium praestabimus et ad parentes tuos iter monstrabimus.*' *et unus manu secutus prehensio loro (retrosum me circumtorquet).* The last three words are original. There is a marginal variant, by the first hand, *phi*, on which Helm remarks '*nescio quo pertineat: voluitne phibebimus?*'  $\phi$ 's supplementer agrees with F rewritten, except that he has *an* for *at*, *furtim uisere properas* for *interuivere properabas*, *et compendiosum ad domos* for *et ad parentes tuos*, and *et manu iniecta* for *et unus manu*: also, according to**

Vliet (I m difficult to r Helm) F's that F's at interesting I.: an A1 I bimus) A1 compendiosum rewritten, a attempt by writing of q only a reco interuivere p compendiosum secutus B2 these reading proves direc phi, which c readings (f genuine rea supplement attempt to supplemente furtim is at margin: F's (if Vliet is r and varies i that F's te properas? se tuos monstrab fits the spac defensible r Ammianus curram: com Petronius, a same sense i sense, Prude Frogs 123  $\bar{\rho}\epsilon\iota\pi\iota\tau\bar{\epsilon}$  pendiosus in far the most et dictum iur (64, 10) et u the speech obviously th head-rope ar F [Hild.]  $\phi$  printed expect misled his s in the conte sound conje prints in his or erasure (obtrudit E a

Vliet (I made no note), *praebemus* for *praestabimus*. It is clear that F was very difficult to read when  $\phi$  was copied, and there is little justification for following (with Helm) F's rewritten text as though it were authoritative (Helm, however, records that F's *at* is rewritten, and adopts *an* from  $\phi$ ). The evidence of the later MSS. is interesting: I will take I., II., and III. separately (I have no record of IV. or of L2). I.: *an* A1 E  $\alpha$ : *interuivere properas* A1 L1 E  $\alpha$ : *prohibemus* (for F's rewritten *praestabimus*) A1 L1, *phibemus* E, *prebebis*  $\alpha$ : *et compendiosum ad tuos iter* A1 L1  $\alpha$ , *et compendiosum iter ad tuos* E: *et uerbum manu secutus* A1 L1 E  $\alpha$ . II. agrees with F rewritten, and may well be the source of the rewriting: I suspect that it represents an attempt by the scribe of II.'s common ancestor to read F, made after the original writing of  $\phi$ , and before the rewriting of F. III. is clearly based on I., but I have only a record of B2 and Vliet's notes on  $\delta$ . *an* B2: *parentes tuos* omitted before *interuivere properabas* (which is in that form) B2: *phibemus* B2, *phibebimus*  $\delta^*$ : *et compendiosum ad parentes tuos monstrabimus*, omitting *iter*, B2: *et uerbum manu iniecta secutus* B2  $\delta^*$  (clearly I +  $\phi$ 's supplement). Certain important facts emerge from these readings. (i.) The presence in I. and III. of *prohibemus*, *perhibemus*, *perhibebimus* proves direct descent from F: we cannot dissociate these readings from F's marginal *phi*, which  $\phi$  ignores. (ii.) The absence of most of the supplemented  $\phi$ 's distinctive readings (*furtim uisere*, *ad domos*, *iniecta*) makes it probable that *compendiosum* is a genuine reading of F, independently recovered by the ancestor of I. and by the supplementer of  $\phi$ . It is legitimate, then, to use the evidence of all Classes in the attempt to recover F's original text: with a bias in favour of I., III., and  $\phi$ 's supplementer, against II. and the rewritten F. Of the distinctive ( $\phi$ ) readings, *furtim* is attractive. E's *perhibemus* is probably the pure I. tradition, following F's margin: F's text may have had *phibemus*, the Plautine form of *praebemus*, which latter (if Vliet is right) is read here by  $\phi$ 's supplementer: *iter* is absent from B2 of III., and varies its position in I., so that it may well be an intrusion from II. I suggest that F's text originally ran: '*An tu, probissima puella, parentes tuos furtim uisere properas? sed nos et solitudini tuae praesidium praehibemus* (mgn. *phi*) *et compendiosum ad tuos monstrabimus*'. *et uerbum manu secutus prehensio loro retrorsum me circumtorquet*. This fits the space well: with *iter* it is a tight fit. Whether *compendiosum* without *iter* is a defensible reading may be doubted: Justin (38. 9. 6) has *compendiosos tramites*, and Ammianus (16. 2. 4) *compendiosas uias*: Mart. Cap. (3. 263) has *compendiosiora percurram*: *compendiaria* is used absolutely, in the sense of 'a short cut,' by Varro Petronius, and Seneca, beside Cicero's *compendiaria uia*, and *compendium* is used in the same sense by Tacitus, Pliny, and others. We may further compare, for the general sense, Prudentius in Laurent. 334 *mortis citae | compendiosos exitus*, and Aristophanes Frogs 123  $\alpha\lambda\lambda' \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \alpha\pi\rho\alpha\pi\theta\varsigma \xi\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma \tau\epsilon\rho\tau\iota\mu\epsilon\acute{\nu}\eta\eta | \eta \delta\iota\alpha \theta\upsilon\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ . Apuleius uses *compendiosum* in Met. XI. 22 (284, 17) *compendiosa uerba*. In 152, 3, *uerbum manu secutus* is far the most attractive reading. Apuleius likes this turn of phrase: cf. I. 26 (24, 1) *et dictum iure iurando secutus*, II. 11 (34, 17) *quod dictum ipsius Milo risu secutus*, III. 16 (64, 10) *et uerbum facto secutus*. Moreover, *unus manu secutus* is here intolerably flat: the speech is introduced by the words (151, 25) *et unus e numero sic appellat*, and it is obviously this speaker, and not a second *unus*, who caps his tirade by seizing the head-rope and belabouring Lucius. VII. 11 (162, 16) [*expeditionum* Helm] *expositionum* F [Hild.]  $\phi$  [Hild. Vliet], *expositionum* A1 L1 E II. III., *expeditionum*  $\alpha$ . Eyss, who printed *expeditionum* without comment, seems here, as in VI. 18 quoted above, to have misled his successors. I think that *expositionum* may just conceivably be defensible, in the context, in the sense of 'puttings up for sale,' but *expeditionum* is probably a sound conjecture. †VII. 28 (176, 9) [Helm '*obtruditq*; (*q*; induct., om.  $\phi$ )] Helm prints in his text simply *obtrudit* *obtrudit*; *q*; F [Eyss. Vliet], with no crossing out or erasure (it represents, of course, *obtruditusque*) *obtrudit*  $\phi$ : *obtruditurque* A1 B1, *obtrudit* E  $\alpha$  II. III. Salmasius, knowing B1's reading *obtruditurque*, conjectured

*obtrudit usque*, which was adopted by Vliet, who wrongly ascribed it to Sauppe, a mistake which Helm<sup>1</sup> repeats. It seems clear that *obtrudit usque* should be read. The sentence then runs . . . *titionem gerens mediis inguinibus obtrudit usque, donec* . . . †VII. 28 (176, 10) [*misus praesidio liquida fimo* Helm] *misus praesidio liquida simo* F φ (in φ *misus* altered to *inismus*). Hild. reported F as *nusus*, Vliet φ as *innisus*. Other MSS.: *miserus* A1, *inixus* E a: *nisus* II.: *uissus* B2 of III. *liquidissimo* A1, *liquidissimo* E S\*, *liquida fimo* α II. III. No doubt *fimo* is a sound conjecture, but *misus* may be a corruption of *innisus*. †VIII. 1 (177, 2) [*possent* Helm] *possint* F. The *nt* has the special optional ligature for final *nt* discussed by Lowe, *Benev. Script.*, p. 145: the word is untouched, and only one stroke precedes the ligature. *possent* φ: *possunt* A1 B1 L1, *possint* E a, with G B3 of II.: *possent* V6 N3 of II., B2 of III. No doubt *possint* is right: it is a more attractive reading in itself than *possent*. †VIII. 1 (177, 3) [*stilos* Helm] *stilos* (altered from *stilus*) F, *stilus* φ (L2): *stilum* A1 L1 V2 α, *solum* E: *stilos* II. III. Probably *stilus* is a corruption due to the termination of the preceding *quidus* (for parallels in F see Helm, *Florida*, p. xlix): but it may be a corruption of either *stilos* or *stilum*: I incline to prefer *stilos*. †VIII. 24 (178, 22) [*indagaturus feras*, <si> *quid tamen in capreis feritatis est* Helm. The <si> is an old conjecture adopted by Helm.] qđ F, q φ. Both abbreviations mean *quod* and nothing else (see Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 191). *quod* A1 L1 E α II. IV.: *quid* B2 N2 of III., *qui* δ of III. Probably *quod* is the true reading. †VIII. 5 (180, 10) [*laniauit* Helm] *laniatum* F φ [Hild.]: *laniatum* A1 L1 (V2, probably: it has *auit* in erasure): *laniauit* E α II. III. (N2 V7 B2, but L3 *laniat*): *laniatum* IV. We must emend or supplement *laniatum*, but it is not obvious that *laniauit* is the right change: *laniat* (as L3), *laniat* followed by *tum* or *tamen*, *laniatum* followed by a lost verb, suggest themselves as alternatives. †VIII. 6 (180, 24) [Helm 'ad nostri similitu dinē potius legi quam [amaritu] dinē . . . φ, amaritudinē.' The following words in F are *qui uere lamentabamur*] I found *similitu* in F quite illegible, as did Eyss. and Vliet, but Lowe (*Class. Quart.* XIV., 1920, p. 152), with Professor Rostagno's help, made out the initial *s*. In φ, Vliet and Lowe<sup>2</sup> state that the original scribe omitted everything between *sic* and *lamentabamur* (not inclusive), and that the present filling in, *ad nostram amaritudinem qui uere*, is due to a later hand. This is certainly true, except that the second *e* of *uere* is (I think) original (hence, perhaps, L5 V5 V3 L4 of Class IV. read *uerum elamentabamur*). φ's supplementer here is probably, as Vliet says, the supplementer of VI. 28, etc. (150, 13, etc.), already discussed. Here II. (a) omit everything between *adfinxit* (180, 23) and *manus* (180, 25) not inclusive: II. (b) have been supplemented here, as in the rent passages. Other MSS.: *ad nostri similitudinem qui uere lamentabamur* A1 E a. The supplement of II. (b) is a mixture of III. and IV., quoted below—it runs *ad nostram similitudinem qui uerum elamentabamur*. III. has *ad nostram similitudinem qui uere lamentabamur*, that is, I's reading, with *nostram* for *nostri*, perhaps influenced by φ or IV. IV. has *ad nostram amaritudinem qui uerum elamentabamur*. It is obvious that here I. has alone preserved F's true reading, which baffled φ's original scribe seven centuries ago, and which is illegible, or almost illegible, to-day. †VIII. 12 (186, 28) [Helm 'ac tu in (c tu in in ras. al. m. scr., fuit a . . . le). φ, attale']. Helm's report is correct: I think one can distinguish as much as *at . . . le* in F. Other MSS.: *attolle* A1 L1 α (E *att\*lle*, \* illegible): *ac tu in* II. and L5 of IV.: *at tu in* III. and V3 V5 of IV. The *attolle* of I. may be a conjecture (it is clearly right, and all editors print it), but it may be a correct record of F's original state. It should be noted that in Beneventan *ta* is exactly as long as *tol*. †VIII. 20 (192, 21) [Helm 'auū litt. paul. refict. sed fuit id. φ, al. m. in lac. postea add. auū'] *ouū* F

<sup>1</sup> Except that in his 1913 edition Helm changes 'Sauppe' to 'Seyffert,' rightly up to a point: the article to which Vliet referred (a review of Eyss. in *Phil. Anzeiger*, 1871) was in fact by

Seyffert.

<sup>2</sup> I am glad here to have Lowe's support in agreeing with Vliet against Helm in the matter of φ's supplemented lacunae.

before rew  
aunm II. III  
be reconside  
and 25) [om  
ōipotens by th  
(rens) added  
et omniparen  
misera φ. I  
it may well  
to print mi  
Goddess, as  
discurrere).  
seruum nobis  
the feminine  
first detecte  
doubt right  
κίναδοι, ad  
συντῆ πρόθεν  
F variant:  
[Helm '•pu  
that an initi  
altered by a  
pouolant A1,  
to support  
†IX. 2 (204  
uenabulis φ:  
will admit  
gubernaculum  
subacturi'].  
E α II. III.  
in Mnem. 1  
Kühner-Ho  
seems, at a  
'uocari (φ)  
baffling: I  
to uocantis  
has uocari, l

tions are po  
possible, bu  
(C al. m. ex  
which seem  
but I made  
printed. †  
Vliet]: *intec*  
but it has b

In the  
which were  
often most

<sup>1</sup> In B3 the

before rewriting, almost certainly:  $\phi$  as Helm reports. *ouiū* A1, *auxilium* E a S\*: *auium* II. III. I think *auium* is probably a sound conjecture, but the passage should be reconsidered in the knowledge of F's probable true reading. VIII. 25 (196, 24 and 25) [*omnipotens et omniparens* Helm]. *oīps* & *oīpatens* F (the last word altered from *oīpotens* by the original hand: a later hand has made it *oīparens*). *omīps* & *oīpa,rens*  $\phi$  (*rens* added in a lacuna by a later hand). *omnipotens et omnipatens* A1 E: *omnipotens et omniparens* a II. III. †VIII. 25 (197, 4) [*miser* Helm] *miser*\* F (a letter erased), *misera*  $\phi$ . In F a marginal variant (now illegible) has been erased opposite this line: it may well have been *miser*. Other MSS.: *miser* I, II.<sup>1</sup> III. I should not hesitate to print *misera*. The speaker is the old *cinaedus* Philebus, priest of the Syrian Goddess, and the epithet applies to himself (*egoque misera cogar crinibus solutis discurrere*). In the next chapter Philebus calls to his *chorus cinaedorum* '*puellae, seruum uobis pulchellum en ecce mercata perduxī*': in that passage F, A1, and  $\phi$  all have the feminine termination; but there too F has been altered (to *mercatus*), an alteration first detected by Eyss., and confirmed by Vliet and Helm, who both print *mercata*, no doubt rightly. So in the Lucianic *Asinus*, c. 35 (as Vliet pointed out), the same *κίναϊδοι*, addressed by Philebus as *κοράσια*, retort *Τούτων οὐ δοῦλον ἀλλὰ νυμφίον σαντῇ πόθεν ἄγεις λαβοῦσα*; Here I., at least, may well be following an original F variant: but that variant was obviously inferior to the text. †VIII. 27 (198, 23) [Helm '*puolant* (eras. p).  $\phi$ , *puolant*']. Helm (who follows Eyss.) is right in saying that an initial *p* has been erased, but he did not notice that the existing *p* is crudely altered by a late hand from *o*. F had *ponolant*. In  $\phi$  *p* is all by the original scribe. *ponolant* A1, *puolant* E a II. III. Helm prints *peruolant*, but F's true reading seems to support Scriverius' suggestion *pronolant*, which Vliet accepted on its merits. †IX. 2 (204, 7) [*uenabulis* Helm] *uenaculis* (altered to *uenabulis* by another hand) F, *uenabulis*  $\phi$ : *uenaculis* A1 E a: *uenabulis* II. III. I do not know whether philologists will admit *uenaculum* as a possible doublet of *uenabulum*, on the analogy of e.g. *gubernaculum*, *obstaculum*. †IX. 8 (208, 22) [Helm '*subactu\*ri* (vid. eras. r).  $\phi$ , *subacturi*']. The erased letter in F might equally well be *i*. *subactu iri* A1: *subacturi* E a II. III. Helm prints *subactu* < *m i* > *ri*, Vliet *subactui*, for which form see Vliet in *Mnem.* 1896, p. 262, the references in *Arch. f. lat. Lex.*, Index i-x, p. 596, Kühner-Holzweissig, p. 690d, and Neue-Wagener, *Lat. Formenl.*<sup>3</sup> III. 177. A1 seems, at all events, to have preserved F's true text. †IX. 10 (210, 7) [Helm '*uocari* ( $\phi$ ) *ri* in ras. al. m., ultima litt. fuit s; fuitne tis?']. I found F's erasure baffling: I am not sure that I checked  $\phi$ . Other MSS.: *uocaritis* A1 a S\* (corrupted to *uocantis* B1): *uocari* E II. (if Oudendorp can be trusted: I only know B3, which has *uocari*, but perhaps with a final *s* erased): *uocati* B2  $\delta^*$  of III. Various explanations are possible. I think the best is that F had *uocatis*. Both *uocatis* and *uocari* are possible, but *uocari* is much the more attractive. †X. 16 (249, 21) [Helm '*Clamor* (C al. m. ex c)]. Helm is right, but he has overlooked an erasure before *Clamor*, which seems to be of &. I have no record of  $\phi$ . *et clamor* B1 E a (probably also A1, but I made no note), also B2  $\delta^*$  of III.: *Clamor* II. Presumably *Et clamor* should be printed. †XI. 4 (268, 23) [*intexam* Helm] *intectam* F [Hild., Eyss., Vliet]  $\phi$  [Hild., Vliet]: *intectam* A1 a II., *intexam* E III. (B2  $\delta^*$ ). I doubt if *intectam* is defensible, but it has been defended: as F's reading, it deserves to be considered.

## (B) ORIGINAL VARIANTS IN F.

In the following pages I shall give passages where I. has preserved readings which were probably or certainly original variants in F. That such variants in F are often most valuable is universally admitted: in Helm's words (*Florida*, p. xxxiv)

<sup>1</sup> In B<sup>3</sup> the abbreviation for *ser* is remade in erasure, but it seems at first to have had *miser* in full.

'saepius vera lectio in margine exstat.' In some cases the variants are still legible in F, but many have been wholly or partially erased, and, though we know that they existed, we do not know (except by inference) what they were. It is desirable, therefore, to begin by proving that I. has in fact a marked liking (often shared by II.) for F's variants, and that its choice and rejection of them is largely, at least, independent of  $\phi$ . The scribe of  $\phi$  sometimes follows the variant, where I. follows the text; sometimes the text, where I. follows the variant. At other times  $\phi$  and I. agree in ignoring the variant or in ignoring the text. It will be enough at this point to quote a few passages where I. has adopted variants ignored by  $\phi$ , but still visible in F, and recorded by Helm. I give them briefly, using Fv as a symbol for 'original variant in F': I. II., etc., will not imply the agreement of all members of the Class. I. 22 (20, 6) *fortiter* F  $\phi$  II., *firmiter* Fv I. III.: I. 9 (33, 2) *adtraxerat* F  $\phi$ , *adstrinxerat* Fv I. II. III.: II. 24 (45, 5) *quassato* F  $\phi$  IV., *quassanti* Fv I. II. III.: IV. 1 (74, 16) *leuigatos* F  $\phi$  II. III., *leuatos* Fv I.: VI. 20 (143, 13) *prospicua* F  $\phi$  II., *uel propitia* Fv I., *propitia* III.: we shall meet other instances of I.'s slavish retention of such *vel*'s: VII. 27 (175, 21) *deiecto* F  $\phi$  II. III., *derelicto* Fv I.: VIII. 26 (198, 2) *choraula* F  $\phi$  II. III., *ceraula* Fv I.: IX. 9 (209, 11) *curriculi* F  $\phi$ , *curuli* Fv I., *circuli* III., phrase omitted II. (B3): XI. 9 (273, 7) *facuum lumine* F  $\phi$  II., *facti luminis* Fv, *ficti luminis* I., *factium luminis* III.: XI. 11 (274, 22) *huius* F  $\phi$  II., *cuius* Fv I. III.: XI. 22 (283, 25) *competeret* F  $\phi$  II. III., *comperiret* Fv I. These instances suffice to prove that in passages where F shows an illegible variant, ignored by  $\phi$ , while I. shows a novel reading, it is not unlikely that I. has preserved the reading of F's variant.

I now pass to a selected list of passages where I. throws new light on F's original variants: here, as before,  $\phi$ 's readings have not been hitherto recorded, unless an editor's name is attached to them:

+I. 17 (16, 1) [*miser* Helm] *miser* F, in margin *res: re* is by the first hand, but s (which has been crossed out) is later. I think that a later hand has tried to change *miser* to *mire*. [Hild. seems to record this variant, though his language is obscure: he writes of F 'quamquam in textu *miser* habet, ab eadem manu correctus est in *mire*.' Subsequent editors are silent.] *miser*  $\phi$ : *mire* A1 E a: *miser* L1 V2 II. III. IV. I think that *mire* is defensible, but I prefer *miser*. +I. 22 (20, 15) [*foribus* Helm]. *foribus* F, but a word ending in ; (=us) was written over *foribus* by the first hand, which also placed a row of dots under it: the word *fortiter* earlier in this chapter (20, 6) was altered to *firmiter* in exactly the same way: there *firm*, written above, has been partially erased, and the dots below almost completely (see Helm, *ad loc.*: he there read the letters, but missed the dots). *edibus*  $\phi$ : *edibus* I. III. (but V7 has also the variant *foribus* in text): *foribus* II. (eight MSS. checked: V6 has also variant *edibus* in text): *edibus* L5 of IV., *foribus* V5 of IV. Presumably F's scribe changed *foribus* to *edibus*, and I fancy that he was right. II. 14 (36, 19) [*etiam arisnotus unicus frater meus* Helm]. F has two dots over the *a* of *arisnotus* (the scribe's commonest method of calling attention to a marginal note), and in the margin, by the first hand, *nom̄ ē* (= *nomen est*). This was doubtless explanatory, but I. and II. treated it as an omitted phrase, and inserted it: it has influenced all MSS., except  $\phi$ , which shows no trace of it. *etiam nom̄ ē arisnotus* A1 L1: *etiam nomine arisnatus* E a (with *arisuatus*): *cui nomen est arisnotus* II. (most MSS. checked) III. (V7 N2  $\delta$  B2) IV. (L5 V5). This well illustrates both the strength of F's influence, and the extraordinary faithfulness of A1 to F. +III. 1 (52, 8) [*uesperni* Helm]. *uesperni* F  $\phi$  (but  $\phi$ , as Helm says, has *ti* added by a later hand). But Helm has not noticed the erasure in F of an original variant over *uesperni*. Other MSS.: *uel uespertini* A1 E a: *uesperni* II.: *uespertini* L1 III. Probably I. here preserve F's variant, though in X. 35 (266, 8) they have altered F  $\phi$ 's *uespernae* to *uespertinae* without any such justification. +III. 2 (53, 21) [Helm '*pducunt* (sed ras. supra et infra *p*, ut videatur fuisse *p*)  $\phi$ : *pducunt*.'] Helm's explanation of the erasure below *p* seems to be right, but it cannot explain an

erasure a  
character  
margin, v  
Other M  
(116, 17)  
u of som  
have bee  
Lowe, of  
colubra oc  
which is  
quod iam  
The phra  
IX. 11 m  
it was th  
may well  
recalcans.  
r, and in  
suspinitus  
this unco  
dentē epul  
and marg  
certain, e  
for final  
but it is  
compulso  
and that  
at bay.  
rimatur.  
it is used  
and -sus:  
Butler a  
futuras v  
modo futu  
Not mer  
the first  
clearly v  
kindly co  
quodam m  
It seems  
he mean  
phrase f  
A strikin  
14 and 1  
uelim sin  
whole of  
to find a  
+VIII. 1  
where a  
all editor  
the truth  
nothing  
re-exami

erasure above *p*. That erasure exists, and is almost certainly the erasure of the characteristic *..* of F's first hand. No doubt it refers to a short erasure visible in the margin, which we may guess to have been a variant *p*, inserted by the first hand. Other MSS.: *perducunt* A1 E a II. III. Both readings are defensible. †V. 17 (116, 17) [*colubrum* Helm] *colubrum* F *φ*, but in F there is an erasure over the second *u* of something by the first hand, which Michaelis reports as *i* erased: but it may have been a non-Beneventan *a*, such as F often uses when pressed for space (cf. Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 133). *colubram* A1 E a: *colubrum* II. III. Neither *coluber* nor *colubra* occurs elsewhere in Apuleius, but he may well have chosen the feminine form, which is often used generically. †VI. 19 (143, 7) [Helm 'ad *recolens* alqd. in mg. add. quod iam non dispicitur; *recolans* non cognoui: *recolans* Oudendorp, cf. 211, 8']. The phrase is *recolens priora uestigia*: the passage (211, 8) to which Helm refers is IX. 11 *mea recolans uestigia*. Oudendorp read *recolans*, but not as a conjecture: it was the traditional reading. F's illegible marginal note cannot be *recolans*, but it may well be e.g. *calc*: *recolens φ*: *recolans* A1 L1 E a: *recolens* II. III. I should print *recolans*. †VI. 29 (151, 13) [*suspiritus* Helm]. *suspiritus* F *φ*, but in F *..* over the *r*, and in the margin, by the first hand, *vat* ;. Other MSS.: *suspiratus* A1 E a III.: *suspiritus* II. For *suspiratus* cf. Ovid, *Met.* XIV. 129. Apuleius may well have chosen this uncommon form. †VIII. 5 (180, 1) [Helm 'dente *cōpulsu* (*φ*) in mg. ead. m. add. *dentē cōpulsū*']. F's variant is undoubtedly by the first hand: *..* is used both in text and margin: but I think Helm has read it too confidently. Nothing seemed to me certain, except that the first word ended with the projecting Beneventan abbreviation for final *m*, while the second began with *cō*: this at once suggests '*dentem compulsu*,' but it is merely a suggestion. *dente compulsu φ*: *dentium compulsu* A1 V2 E a: *dente compulsu* II. III. IV. It can scarcely be doubted that I. has preserved F's variant, and that this variant is the better reading: the passage describes a wild boar at bay . . . *incendio feritatis ardescens dentium compulsu, quem primum insiliat, cunctabunda rimatur*. The noun *compulsus* is very rare, but Probus quotes it (in the ablative) and it is used by Avienus and Marius Victorinus. Apuleius loves verbal nouns in *-tus* and *-sus*: in the *Apologia* alone he uses eight which have no earlier authority (see Butler and Owen, *Apulei Apologia*, 1914, p. xlix.) †VIII. 12 (186, 12) [Helm 'iam *futuras* vdl. cod. Dorv. secutus']. In F the passage runs *oculi isti . . . qui quodam modo futuras tenebras aspicantes unientes poenas antecedunt*. Helm's note is inadequate.

Not merely has *φ* (as Vliet almost correctly states) *quodam modo tam iā facturā* (*u* by the first hand), but in F itself, as no one has observed, *tam iā* by the first hand is still clearly visible written above *futuras*, though partially erased (Professor Rostagno kindly confirmed this for me). Other MSS.: *quodam modo tamen iam futuras* A1 a IV.: *quodam modo futuras* B3 V4 of II.: *quodam modo iam futuras* E of I., V6 N3 of II., III. It seems clear that *φ* and I. rightly understood the intention of F's original scribe: he meant to add a phrase which he had accidentally dropped, not to substitute one phrase for another. Obviously we ought to print *qui quodam modo tamen iam futuras*. A striking and instructive contrast with this passage occurs in the same chapter (186, 14 and 15), where *φ* has, without justification, expanded F's *absit ut simili* to *absit ut uelini simili*. This false reading has not affected I., but it has been adopted by the whole of III. and IV. and by V4 V6 N3 (but not by B3) of II. It would be difficult to find a neater illustration of the merits of I., and of its general independence of *φ*. †VIII. 13 (187, 12): this is a very interesting case: it is, I think, the only passage where a reading of *φ*'s, not an easy correction of F's, is yet so obviously excellent that all editors accept it. It is not in *φ*'s manner: and it haunted me until I happened on the truth. [Helm '*caput. φ, capulū*']. On my first inspection of F, in 1910, I noticed nothing that threw light on the matter: *caput* is original and untouched: but when I re-examined F ten years later, my eye was caught by an erasure in the margin,

opposite the line which ends with the words preceding *caput* (*Sed Charite | caput*). I found that on close inspection *cap* . . . ~ was distinguishable, also a tall erasure corresponding in position to the *l* of *capulum*: and further that the characteristic ~ was erased over the initial *c* of the erased word (there is, however, no such mark over *caput* or over any other word in the text). I measured the erasure carefully, and found that it was the precise length of *capulū* in F's script. It seems impossible to doubt that an original F variant is the source of  $\phi$ 's *capulum*. Other MSS.: *capulum caput* A1 E S, *capulum capit a*: *caput* II. (P V6 O N1 V4 N3 L6 B3) and III. (L3 N2 V7 B2  $\delta$ ): *capulum* L1 V2 of I., IV. (L5 V3 V5 L4). The classification is unusually complete and clear cut: L1 and V2 are impure members of their class. I.'s original reading was clearly *capulum caput*: IV. copies  $\phi$ 's *capulum*, and the rest have *caput*. It is, I think, probable that I. have borrowed *capulum* from  $\phi$ : such borrowings, resulting in double readings, indisputably occur: for instance, VII. 12 (163, 17) *os partī mortui* F, *oms parati mortī*  $\phi$ : *omnes partim parati mortui* A1 L1, *omnes partim parati mortī* E a. But it is possible that the double reading was taken direct from F, or that *caput* has been borrowed from II. †VIII. 13 (187, 23) [Helm '*pflauit* ( $\phi$ )']  $\phi$  has *pflauit*, but F has *p-flauit*, with an erasure over *fl*. The dash - is later. F's erasure might be of *a*, or of *e*, or even of a small *af* or *ef*. Other MSS.: *pafflauit* A1 L1, *pefflauere a*: *pflauit* E II. III. It seems likely that F had *pflauit* with a variant intended to signify *afflauit* or *efflauit*. Few editors have relished *perflauit*. Hild. printed *perefflauit*, Vliet and Gaselee (after Pricaeus) *proflauit*, Helm (as his own emendation) *efflauit*. Helm's conjecture seems to be supported by the evidence of F and I. †VIII. 18 (191, 5) [*quid miseros homines . . . inuaditis atque obteritis*? Helm]. This is the reading of F and  $\phi$ , but in F two lines of writing, apparently by the first hand, are erased in the margin exactly opposite the line containing *inuaditis atque obteritis*. The erasure is absolutely illegible. Other MSS.: *inuaditis ac prosternitis atque obruitis* A1 E, *inuaditis ac perteritis atque obruitis a*, *inuaditis ac perterretis atque obruitis* S\* (teste Mod.), *inuaditis perteritis atque obruitis* S\* (teste Oud.). All others follow F's text. It seems not unlikely that I.'s reading (probably as given by A1 and E) was an original F variant. It should, however, be pointed out that I. certainly contains some interpolated words and phrases, which seem to have no justification in F: for instance, IV. 17 (87, 15) *specus roridos et fontes amoenos* F  $\phi$ , *specus roridos frigidos et fontes amoenos* A1 L1 (and B2 of III., L5 of IV.), *specus roridos et colles frigidos et fontes amoenos* E a: X. 15 (248, 13) *iam totos ad me dirigunt animos* F  $\phi$ , *iam totos dirigunt ad me omnes animos* A1 a, *iam totos ad me omnes dirigunt oculos atque animos* E. All these seem to be, ultimately, instances of glosses or variants interpolated beside the word glossed. In other cases the gloss seemed to have driven out the word glossed: e.g. VIII. 28 (199, 20) *paruam* F  $\phi$ , *modicam* A1, IX. 5 (206, 18) *lucerna* F  $\phi$  E a, *lanterna* A1. In one case, at least, the intruder has failed to shake off the *uel* which introduced it: VI. 19 (142, 17) *telam struentes* F  $\phi$  a, *telam listruentes* E, *telam listrientes* A1 (no doubt corruptions of *uel instruentes*). Sometimes the true reading has been restored as a variant, and stands, with an apologetic *uel*, beside the usurper: e.g. X. 15 (248, 5) *muscas* F  $\phi$ , *mures uel muscas* A1 E a S\*: sometimes the true restored reading has triumphed, but still retains the tell-tale *uel*; e.g. II. 28 (48, 21) *obuersus incrementa* F  $\phi$ , *obuersus uel incrementa* A1 L1 E a, and B3 of II. But I must return to Class I. in its better aspects. †VIII. 22 (194, 14) [*uxori suae* Helm]. *uxori suae* F  $\phi$ , but in F ~ is erased over the *u* of *uxori*, and there is an illegible erasure in the margin. *luxurie suae* A1 L1 E a S°, *uxori suae* II. III. I think that if we change *sue* to *sua*, the new reading is most attractive, and I have little doubt that *luxurie sue*, or, very likely, *sua*, once stood in F's margin. The passage deals with a slave, whose unfaithfulness had driven his wife to child-murder and suicide: *seruulum qui causam tanti sceleris (uxori suae or luxurie suae) praestiterat*. For *luxurie* compare VI. 11 (136, 12), where Venus confines the scalded Cupid to his bedroom, *ne petulanti luxurie uulnus*

*grauaret*.  
 $\phi$  (with m  
 'innouandi  
 which the  
 the small  
 erased m  
 comes fro  
 I hop  
 is of imp  
 that he ca

APPI  
 παρρησι  
 Thes  
 Tiberius  
 adjourned  
 had with  
 The asser  
 his collea  
 or had ac  
 in the ter  
 Cornelius  
 the tyrann  
 trial, Na  
 follow him  
 led the at  
 Such  
 degrees o  
 Paternul  
 Auctor ad  
 Sources fo  
 problems  
 of the lea  
 Spea  
 manum  
 togae laci  
 act—Ap  
 κρᾶσις  
 Herenniu  
 describes  
 historian  
 its aim a

*grauaret.* XI. 4 (269, 4) [Helm 'ad *uirgule* in mg. add. \*\**gule* (fuit *uir* aut *un*)]. *uirgule*  $\phi$  (with no note): *ungule* A1, ? E,  $\alpha$ : *uirgule* II. III. †XI. 15 (277, 22) [Helm 'innouandi ( $\phi$ , al. m. superscr. *u*) parv. ras. supra *ua*']. All editors print *inouanti*, which they ascribe to Aldus or Colvius. Helm has overlooked the fact that, besides the small erasure over *ua* (which we may guess to have been  $\alpha$ ), there is in F an erased marginal variant. *inouanti* A1 E  $\alpha$ : *innouandi* II. III. Probably in( $\alpha$ )*ouanti* comes from F's margin.

I hope that I have killed the doctrine that 'of all the transcripts of F only one is of importance, and that is  $\phi$ .' The man who would decipher F needs all the help that he can get.

οὗτοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

### THREE NOTES ON APPIAN.

#### I.

APPIAN, *B.C.* i. 16. 3, τὸ κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου ἐς τὴν κεφαλὴν περισύρατο, εἴτε τῷ παρασήμερ τοῦ σχήματος πλέονάς οἱ συντρέχειν ἐπισπώμενος.

These words occur in Appian's account of the riot which led to the death of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus in 133 B.C. The tribunician elections had been adjourned from the previous day, and Gracchus, who irregularly sought re-election, had with his supporters taken possession of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol. The assembly broke up in disorder amid wild rumours that Gracchus had deposed all his colleagues or had declared himself tribune for the following year without election or had actually demanded the diadem. The Senate meanwhile had been in session in the temple of Fides, and upon receipt of the news from the Capitol Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio urged the consul, Publius Mucius Scaevola, to crush the tyrant. When he declared that he would not put any citizen to death without trial, Nasica, calling loudly upon those who desired the safety of their country to follow him, mounted the Capitol at the head of a considerable body of Senators and led the attack on Gracchus and his partisans.

Such is in outline the story told, with some discrepancies<sup>1</sup> and in varying degrees of fulness, by Appian, *B.C.* i. 14-16, Plutarch, *Tib. Gracchus*, 16-19, Velleius Paterculus, ii. 3, Valerius Maximus, iii. 2. 17, Cicero, *Tusc.* iv. 23. 51, Livy, *Ep.* lviii, Auctor *ad Herennium*, iv. 55. 68, and other authors referred to in Greenidge and Clay, *Sources for Roman History*, 7 sqq. I am not here concerned with the larger historical problems raised by these narratives, but only with a single action on the part of one of the leading actors in the tragedy.

Speaking of Scipio Nasica, Valerius Maximus uses the phrase 'deinde laeuam manum parte togae circumdedit,' and Velleius refers to 'circumdata laeua brachio togae lacinia.' On the other hand, Appian and Plutarch both speak of a different act—Appian in the words above quoted, Plutarch in the very similar phrase τὸ κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου θέμενος ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐχώρει (*Tib. Gr.* 19. 3). The author *ad Herennium* may be thinking of either of these versions, or of neither, when he describes Nasica as standing on the Capitol 'contorta toga.' The two Latin historians give no explanation of the action they describe, but apparently regard its aim as that of freeing the legs from the hampering folds of the toga, and perhaps

<sup>1</sup> For these see especially E. Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte der Gracchenzeit*, 3 sqq.

also of providing a means of defence which might partly compensate for the lack of shields. To Eduard Meyer this was an obvious and sufficient reason, and he maintained that 'Appian puzzles himself needlessly to explain this very natural procedure: in order to be able to dash up the Capitol, the legs must be free, and at the same time the toga wound round the head serves as a protection' (*Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen*, 95, note 2). But the Greek historians did not think thus. In Plutarch's narrative Nasica alone treats his toga in this way, while the Senators who follow him wrap their togas round their hands (τῇ χειρὶ τὴν τήβεννον περιελίξας, *Tib. Gr.* 19. 3). In Appian, again, none of the three suggested explanations of Nasica's act refers either to mobility or to protection. E. Kornemann, who calls attention to the prominence of Nasica's pontificate in the story told by Appian and Plutarch and its neglect by the Latin historians, seems to me to be right in combating Meyer's criticism<sup>1</sup> and in concluding that 'diese Massnahme . . . ist nichts anderes als die Herstellung der Priestertracht' (*Zur Geschichte der Gracchenzeit*, 5).

But is Kornemann equally right in maintaining (*loc. cit.*) that for Nasica's action Appian 'vainly sought an explanation'? What did Appian mean in speaking of Nasica as possibly τῷ παρασήμῳ τοῦ σχήματος πλέωνας οἱ συντρέχειν ἐπισώμενος?

It is not a question of historical fact which here confronts us, for we are dealing with the meaning of Appian's explanation, not with its validity; still less is it a problem of textual criticism, for the MSS. are unanimous. It is simply a question of translation and interpretation.

Candidus' rendering, quoted by Mendelssohn *ad loc.*, is 'siue hoc gestu plures excitaturus siue ad cursum futurus aptior,' which suggests either that he had a different text before him or that he was baffled by the phrase. Schweighäuser renders 'siue quod miro illo habitu plures ad sese sequendum adlicere uellet,' but does not touch upon the difficulty in his notes. Horace White is content with this view, translating 'either to induce a greater number to go with him by the singularity of his appearance.'<sup>2</sup> E. F. M. Benecke, on the other hand, has 'either to get more to follow him by displaying the badge of his rank.' Finally, Strachan-Davidson comments thus upon the phrase:

'Benecke's interpretation, "by displaying the badge of his rank" (i.e. the *toga praetexta* which Nasica would wear as pontiff), is tempting, but I can find no such sense for σχῆμα: it seems best to follow Schweighäuser and translate "by the strangeness of his appearance."

In this view I have never been able to acquiesce. That Scipio Nasica,<sup>3</sup> a member of one of the proudest families of the Roman aristocracy, who had been consul five years earlier and was now *pontifex maximus*,<sup>4</sup> should have sought to swell the number of his followers by the *bizarrie* of his appearance seems to me not only to run counter to all historical probability but also, and this is more important for our present purpose, to be inconsistent with the tone of Appian's narrative, which goes on to tell how the people εἰσαν ὡς κατ' ἀξίωσιν ἀνδρὶ ἀρίστῳ. Scipio's aim was to secure not only a large crowd but the active support of all who, whether Senators or

<sup>1</sup> Meyer's omission of the note in question from the second edition of his essay (*Kleine Schriften*, 412) is a tacit admission of the force of Kornemann's polemic.

<sup>2</sup> *The Roman History of Appian*, London, 1889. No change has been made in the revised version published in the Loeb Library, 1913.

<sup>3</sup> See F. Münzer's article in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.* IV. 1501 sqq., s.v. Cornelius, No. 354, and

the genealogical table, *ibid.* 1429 sq.

<sup>4</sup> E. Meyer (*Untersuchungen*, 95, note 1) declared that Appian was mistaken in regarding him as already *pontifex maximus*; but Münzer (*op. cit.* 1503) and Kornemann (*op. cit.* 4, note 3) have defended Appian with a cogency which has convinced Meyer himself (*Kleine Schriften*, 412, note 1).

not, were averted. to the fore, take the le followers, t the recogn by the dis the eye an head?

To th linguistic would th 'marked,'

Lidde significant 'gesture' meaning f 'significant'

What 'by displa context ad παράσημον Syr. 15, the axes of the τοῖς στρατ στρατηγικὰ 'position,' other exam meaning, t only to tw φέρειν mus as befitted viii. p. 1 (i. p. 223 e παρείχοντο, τὴν ἡγεμονι and stands the Sparta in the sam e.g., ἔσωσε τῆς προξεν Dind.), ἔχ examples honoured In an hon the phrase à savoir c

But a Benecke's which to sense of always, c apparently

not, were anxious that the Gracchan movement should be crushed and the 'tyranny' averted. The consul hung back, none of the other magistrates could or would come to the fore, and it was left to Nasica, though a *privatus* (see Kornemann, *op. cit.* 3), to take the lead. But it was confidence, not curiosity, which he wished to arouse in his followers, the confidence born of the feeling that their leader was no mere upstart but the recognized head of the state religion. How could he win this confidence save by the display of the badge of his office? and how would this more readily catch the eye and the attention of the bystanders than by its display on the pontiff's head?

To this argument from probability and consistency we may add another of a linguistic nature. Appian nowhere, I believe, uses the adjective *παράσημος*, nor would that word, which means primarily 'counterfeit' and secondarily 'conspicuous,' 'marked,' be happily chosen here to denote 'singular,' 'quaint,' 'bizarre.'

Liddell and Scott render the phrase, which is misquoted *ἐν τῷ παρασήμῳ*, 'by the significance of his gesture'; but while we allow that in Appian *σχῆμα* may mean 'gesture' (as it perhaps does in *Iber.* 26 and 53), this version gives to *παράσημον* a meaning for which I find no parallel, nor does Appian indicate wherein that 'significance' lay.

What course, then, is open to us? Can we accept Benecke's rendering, 'by displaying the badge of his rank'? That this is attractive and suits the context admirably no one will deny. The words *τῷ παρασήμῳ* cause no difficulty, for *παράσημον* is regularly used for 'badge,' 'token,' and the like. So Appian uses it in *Syr.* 15, the only other passage in his extant works where it occurs; comparing the six axes of the praetor with the twelve of the consul, he says *τὸ ἥμισυ τῆς ἀξιώσεως ἔστι τοῖσδε τοῖς στρατηγοῖς καὶ τὰ ἡμίσεα παράσημα*. Similarly Plutarch, *Sulla*, 9, refers to the *στρατηγικὰ παράσημα*. The difficulty lies in giving to *σχῆμα* the sense of 'rank,' 'position,' 'office,' which this interpretation demands. In none of the twenty-three other examples which I have collected from Appian does the word seem to have this meaning, and though Liddell and Scott give 'dignity,' 'rank,' they refer specifically only to two passages in Polybius (iii. 85. 9, cf. v. 56), in which the phrase *κατὰ σχῆμα φέρειν* must surely mean 'to bear in a dignified or seemly manner' and not 'to bear as befitted their (his) rank.' Wytttenbach, however, translates (*Plutarchi Moralia*, viii. p. 1509) *σχῆμα* by 'munus, ordo, magistratus' in Aelius Aristides, i. 137 (i. p. 223 ed. Dindorf), *οἱ μὲν* (sc. *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*) *ὄνομα ἡγεμόνων*, *οἱ δ'* (sc. *Ἀθηναῖοι*) *ἔργα παρείχοντο*, καὶ τοσοῦτ' ἀλλίον αὐτοῖς τὸ σχῆμα καθίστατο ὅσ' αὐτῶν ἡγεμόνων αὐτῶν εἶχον τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Here it clearly denotes a *de facto* position in contrast to a nominal one, and stands in sharp antithesis to its use in the phrase *τὴν ἐπὶ σχήματος ἡγεμονίαν* used of the Spartans only a few pages earlier (i. 134 = i. 217 Dind.). In other phrases found in the same author *σχῆμα* approximates perhaps more nearly to 'position' or 'status,' e.g., *ἔσωσε τὸν πρεσβευτὴν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς προξενίας* (i. 144 = i. 233 Dind.), *διὰ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς προξενίας ἀφείσαν* (ii. 217 = ii. 286 Dind.), *τὸ τῆς πρεσβείας σχῆμα* (i. 490 = i. 730 Dind.), *ἔχοντας τὸ τῶν ὑπηκόων σχῆμα* (i. 176 = i. 289 Dind.). Two epigraphical examples afford clearer evidence. At Olympia a certain Claudia Baebia Baebiana is honoured *ἐπὶ σεμνότητι βίου καὶ σωφροσύνῃ ἐν ἱερῇ σχήματι* (*Inscr. von Olympia*, 941). In an honorary inscription of Prusias ad Hypium (Waddington 1178, *I.G. Rom.* iii. 69) the phrase *ἐν τῷ σχήματι* occurs; Waddington comments '*Σχῆμα* signifie ici "dignité," à savoir celle de Bithyniarque,' and Cagnat renders 'in gerendo officio.'

But all this is not conclusive, and while I am not prepared definitely to abandon Benecke's interpretation, to which I have long clung, I wish to suggest an alternative which to some may seem preferable. *Σχῆμα* frequently and easily passes from the sense of 'shape,' 'appearance'—sometimes (as in *B.C.* i. 103, iv. 31), though not always, contrasted with reality—to that of 'guise,' 'uniform,' 'dress.' This is apparently its meaning in Appian, *B.C.* iv. 45 *ἐς στρατηγοῦ σχῆμα κομῆσας ἑαυτὸν*,

v. 126 τὸ σχῆμα ἀλλάξας ἔθει πρὸς τὸν Καίσαρα . . . ὁ δὲ Καίσαρ . . . ἐπεμψεν ἐς 'Ρώμην ἔφ' οὕπερ ἦν σχήματος, v. 130 ἐπὶ κίονος ἐν ἀγορᾷ χρυσοῦς ἐστάναι μετὰ σχήματος οὕπερ ἔχων ἐσῆλθε, and unquestionably in v. 76 σχῆμα τετραγώνον ἔχων καὶ ὑπόδημα 'Αττικόν,<sup>1</sup> with which we may compare the corresponding statement in Plut. *Ant.* 33 τὰ τῆς ἡγεμονίας παράσημα καταλιπὼν οἴκοι μετὰ τῶν γυμνασιαρχικῶν ῥάβδων ἐν ἱματίῳ καὶ φαικασίοις προΐει. Here again two epigraphical examples may help us. An inscription of Prusias ad Hypium (*I. G. Rom.* iii. 1422) commemorates a certain Asclepiades τὸν . . . πρῶτον τειμηθέντ[α] ἀρχοντα ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τῷ τῆς πορφύρας σχήματι, i.e., as the editor explains, *lato clauo exornatum*. In an Athenian decree of about A.D. 205<sup>2</sup> it is resolved that the *cosmetes* be instructed κατὰ τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα [ἀ]γειν 'Ελευσινάδε τοῖς ἐφ[ι]β[ρ]οῖς . . . με[τὰ τ]οῦ εἰθισμένου σχήμα[τος] τῆς ἅμα ἱεροῖς πομπῆς, and later ἀγειν τοὺς ἐφ[ι]β[ρ]οῦς πάλιν 'Ε'λευσινάδε μετὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σχήματος, where the word appears to me to refer to the dress rather than to the formation of the *ephebi*. May not this be the sense in which Appian uses the word in the phrase under discussion? If so, τῷ παρασήμῳ τοῦ σχήματος would mean 'by the badge of his costume,' i.e. 'by (the display of) that part of his robe which indicated his (pontifical) office.' In other words, we have reached an interpretation which, while substantially the same as that of Benecke, uses *σχῆμα* in a sense which is common and well recognized instead of one which is doubtful and, at the best, rare.

## II.

Appian, *B.C.* i. 54. 1, τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ χρόνου κατὰ τὸ ἄστυ οἱ χρῆσται πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐσταιώσαν, οἱ μὲν πράττοντες τὰ χρεῖα σὺν τόκοις κτλ.

With these words Appian introduces his account of the financial crisis at Rome which followed the Social War and culminated in the murder of the urban praetor, A. Sempronius Asellio, in 89 B.C. The facts, which are recorded not only by Appian but also very briefly in the *Epitome* of Livy lxxiv. and with rather more detail by Valerius Maximus (ix. 7. 4), do not here concern us.<sup>3</sup> It is to the difficulty caused by the words οἱ χρῆσται that I turn.

J. L. Strachan-Davidson's comment runs as follows: 'If the text be sound the word must be used in a comprehensive sense to include both parties to a loan.' As the text is allowed to stand, we may infer that Strachan-Davidson accepted as at least possible such a comprehensive use of the term *χρῆσται*, just as other scholars, e.g. Schweighäuser, had previously done. The same explanation was adopted by Horace White, who translated thus: 'About the same time dissensions arose in the city between debtors and creditors since the latter exacted the money due to them with interest.' Mendelssohn, on the other hand, dissatisfied with this solution of the problem, noted in his *apparatus criticus* (ii. p. 617):

'Οἱ χρῆσται cum esse uix possint et debitores et creditores uno eodemque vocabulo comprehensi, πρὸς ἀλλήλους uerba corrupta uidentur. an πρὸς τοὺς δανειστάς? \* οἱ χρῆσται <καὶ οἱ χρεώσται> πρὸς ἀλλ. Nauckius.'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *B.C.* ii. 120, iii. 94, v. 41; more doubtful are iv. 13, 35, v. 11. Porphyrius, *de Abst.* iv. 6, uses of the Egyptian priests the phrase *del ênrôs τοῖ σχήματος «αἱ» χεῖρες*. Numerous other examples from literature are collected in Liddell and Scott and in the *Thesaurus*, s.v.

<sup>2</sup> *I.G.* ii.<sup>2</sup> 1078 (= *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup> 885), l. 10 sqq., 20 sq.; cf. *I.G.* ii.<sup>2</sup> 1079. The inscription is dated by Kirchner and Dittenberger, *ca.* A.D. 220; but

see P. Graindor, *Chronologie des Archontes Athéniens*, 229 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> They are sufficiently dealt with in such standard works as Th. Mommsen, *History of Rome* (English translation, 1887), iii. 258 sq.; W. E. Heitland, *The Roman Republic*, § 857; F. Münzer in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.E.* ii.A, 1363 sq. For the date see also T. Reinach, *Revue Historique*, xlv. 50 sq.

This conjec  
' At the sam  
in a footnot

P. Vier  
prefers ano  
notes (ii. 58

Ο  
δανειστο  
χρῆσται  
maluit

and E. Iliff  
White's tra  
creditors' t  
δανεισται is

That t  
is open to  
boscos, ii.

*Magn. s.vv.*  
etc.) are qu  
literature ill

best of my  
In the form  
both the co

We may co  
meaning of  
rejected, for

always and  
tautologous.

Further  
passage to c  
to say unpa

desire whic  
Appian's w  
following pl

to the credi  
in the term

problem and  
the conjec  
ἀλλήλους ar

least if not  
πράττοντες s

refer, and in  
accusative.

For the  
or rather, i

omission, o  
knew that i  
his conjectu  
to which h

<sup>1</sup> The sole  
χρεώστης as d  
found with th

This conjecture of Nauck has been accepted by E. F. M. Benecke, who translates: 'At the same time the debtors [and the creditors] at Rome had a quarrel,' and refers in a footnote to Nauck's reading.

P. Viereck, the most recent editor of the text of Appian's *Bell. Civ.* (Teubner, 1905) prefers another method of meeting the difficulty; retaining Mendelssohn's text, he notes (ii. 58):

'Οἱ χρήσται <καὶ οἱ χρεώσται> ci. Nauck, praetulerim οἱ χρήσται <καὶ δανεισται> (cf. Dittenb., *Syll. inscr. Graec.*<sup>2</sup> 226, 181; 510, 40), nisi forte οἱ χρήσται et debitores et creditores significat; πρὸς τοὺς δανειστας pro πρὸς ἀλλήλους maluit Mend., haud probabiliter.'

and E. Iliff Robson, who revised and prepared for the press the last two volumes of White's translation for the Loeb Library, adds to the words 'between debtors and creditors' the footnote 'χρήσται in the Greek apparently includes both, unless καὶ δανεισταί is to be inserted.'

That the word χρήσται sometimes means 'debtor' and sometimes 'creditor' is open to no question. The grammarians and the lexicographers (e.g. Choeroboscus, ii. 436 χρήσται δὲ εἰσιν οἱ δανείζοντες καὶ οἱ δανειζόμενοι, Harpocr. s.v., *Etym. Magn.* s.vv. χλόη, χρήστης, Suidas s.vv. χρήστης, χρήσται, χρήστην, Eustath. 1807. 12, etc.) are quite explicit on this point, and many examples occur in extant Greek literature illustrating the use of the word in both senses. In Appian it occurs, to the best of my knowledge, only here and in two other passages, *Mithr.* 22 and *B.C.* ii. 48. In the former it is contrasted with οἱ δανεισταί, in the latter with οἱ δανείσαντες; in both the context shows beyond any possible doubt that it refers only to debtors. We may conclude, I think, that for Appian this is the primary, if not the sole, meaning of the word. If this is so, Nauck's conjecture must be unhesitatingly rejected, for not only does the term χρεώστης not occur in Appian, but its meaning is, always and everywhere,<sup>1</sup> 'debtor,' so that the phrase οἱ χρήσται <καὶ οἱ χρεώσται> is tautologous.

Further, I cannot believe that Appian would have used the term χρήσται in this passage to denote both parties to loan-transactions. Such a use would be harsh, not to say unparalleled, and would be due simply and solely to a desire for brevity—a desire which does not, so far as my impression goes, manifest itself elsewhere in Appian's work. Moreover, the harshness would be increased by the use of the following phrase, οἱ μὲν πράττοντες τὰ χρεῖα κτλ., with reference not to the debtors but to the creditors, i.e. not to the party explicitly named but to that implicitly indicated in the term χρήσται. Are we then to acquiesce in Mendelssohn's solution of the problem and write πρὸς τοὺς δανειστας in place of πρὸς ἀλλήλους? Palaeographically the conjecture has little to recommend it, nor, I must admit, does the phrase πρὸς ἀλλήλους arouse my suspicions. Besides, there is a grammatical obstacle, serious at least if not insuperable, in the way of our acceptance of the conjecture; for οἱ μὲν πράττοντες should agree grammatically with the word for 'creditors' to which they refer, and in Mendelssohn's restoration that word is not in the nominative but in the accusative.

For these reasons I am strongly inclined to write οἱ χρήσται <καὶ οἱ δανεισταί>, or rather, in order to indicate more clearly what I believe to be the source of the omission, οἱ χρῆ<σται καὶ οἱ δανει>σταί. I had reached this conclusion before I knew that it had been to a large extent anticipated by Viereck, and I still prefer it to his conjecture, in which the definite article is omitted before δανεισταί. The passage to which he himself refers in an Olbian inscription, *S.I.G.*<sup>2</sup> 226 (= *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup> 495),

<sup>1</sup> The sole exception is Suidas, who explains χρεώστης as ὁ δανειστής. But the word is never found with this meaning in extant Greek litera-

ture, and it seems best to assume that Suidas is here guilty of an inadvertence.

1. 181 [τοῖς] τε δανεισταῖς καὶ τοῖς χρήσταις, seems to me to lend some support to my suggestion.

## III.

Appian, *B.C.* i. 54. 2, ἀποστραφῆναι γάρ μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ πάλοι Ῥωμαῖοι, καθάπερ Ἕλληνες, τὸ δανεῖζειν ὡς κατηλικὸν καὶ βαρὺ τοῖς πένησι καὶ δύσπεροι καὶ ἐχθροποιόν, ᾧ λόγῳ καὶ Πέρσαι τὸ κίχρασθαι ὡς ἀπατηλὸν τε καὶ φιλοψευδές.

H. White translates the latter part of the sentence thus: 'and by the same kind of reasoning the Persians considered lending as having itself a tendency to deceit and lying.' This rendering seems to me not only to miss the true meaning of κίχρασθαι, which denotes borrowing and not lending, but also to obscure the reasoning which underlay the Persian aversion to borrowing, and to afford no justification for Appian's separation of the Persians from the Greeks and Romans. Benecke's translation gives its true value to τὸ κίχρασθαι, but by rendering the words τὸ δανεῖζειν as 'usury' fails to make sufficiently clear the antithesis between the two verbs.

It has long been recognized<sup>1</sup> that Appian bases his statement regarding the Persians upon Herodotus, an author who finds frequent echoes in Appian's pages.<sup>2</sup> In his account of the manners and customs of the Persians Herodotus says (i. 138) αἰσχιστον δὲ αὐτοῖσι τὸ ψεύδεσθαι νενόμισται, δεύτερα δὲ τὸ ὀφείλειν χρέος, πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων εἴνεκα, μάλιστα δὲ ἀναγκαίην φασὶ εἶναι τὸν ὀφείλοντα καὶ τι ψῆδος λέγειν. In the light of this passage the distinction between Greeks and Romans on the one hand and Persians on the other becomes clear and unmistakable. The former regard the moral effect produced upon the lender; the niggling, shifty spirit of the huckster is fostered, the heart is hardened against the poor, the lender becomes contentious and stirs up bitter feelings of enmity. The Persians look rather to the deterioration brought about in the character of the borrower, who is sorely tempted to have recourse to deceit and lying in order to evade his liabilities. The phrase ᾧ λόγῳ καί, which unites the two statements, is meant to draw attention to the fact that, though the nations of antiquity approached this question from two totally different standpoints, the aversion which each entertained for the giving or accepting of loans at interest was based upon one and the same consideration, namely that of the effect produced by such transactions upon the moral nature of those who were parties to them. If I am right in thus interpreting the passage, I cannot regard as justified the criticism of Strachan-Davidson, 'Appian seems rather to confuse the moral drawbacks attaching to the position of the borrower with the condemnation of usury exacted by the lender.'

M. N. TOD.

<sup>1</sup> See comments *ad loc.* of Schweighäuser, Strachan-Davidson, and others.

<sup>2</sup> A. Zerdik, *Quaestiones Appianae*, Part I.

## Americ

R. S. R.

statement of  
vant, *The Ict*  
advances sev  
obvious effort  
ictus, which in  
of the Iliad an  
and points ou  
into account  
Alice F. Bran  
be retained o  
has, in an im  
*Addendum on*  
<To play wi  
grammatical  
T. Frank, C  
(monumentum  
(a) to a comp  
the first plan  
*Note on the Jo*  
better interpr  
particular the

## Athenae

A. Voglia

Comparetti in  
restores a few  
original was a  
in Thessaly, a  
time was the  
lacunae. V.  
hexameter lin  
tion of her g  
interval of ma  
known as the  
his family. T  
probably a pr  
variously as 'a

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** XLIV. 4. October-December, 1923.

R. S. Radford, *Tibullus and Ovid*, Part III. Concludes the discussion by a statement of the evidence to be derived from the metrical *schemata*. E. H. Sturtevant, *The Ictus of Classical Verse*. Investigates the nature of the *ictus metricus*, and advances seven arguments to show that it was a stress. Lays great emphasis on the obvious efforts of the Roman poets to secure a definite relation between accent and *ictus*, which indicate that the two had a common element. S. E. Bassett, *The Proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Examines the literary merits of the two introductions, and points out certain stylistic and grammatical similarities which should be taken into account in estimating the value of the 'chorizontic view' of the authorship. Alice F. Braunlich, *Against Curtailing Catullus*' Passer. Suggests that vv. 11-13 may be retained on the supposition that they are addressed directly to Lesbia after she has, in an imagined aside, indicated that the suit is pleasing to her. R. G. Kent, *Addendum on Catullus*' Passer. Also retains vv. 11-13, but explains the meaning as <To play with you as she does> *would be*, etc. *Est* is equivalent to *sit*, and the grammatical difficulty is caused by the shift to another type of conditional sentence. T. Frank, *Cicero Ad Atticum* IV. 16, 14. By a slight rearrangement of the text (*monumentum . . . solebas* placed after *basilicam*) finds a double reference in the passage (a) to a complete rebuilding of the Basilica Aemiliana undertaken by Paulus, (b) to the first plans for the Basilica Julia, entrusted to Cicero and Oppius. W. S. Fox, *Note on the Johns Hopkins Tabellae Defixionum*. Accepts certain suggestions for the better interpretation of these tablets made by E. Vetter in *Glotta* XII. (1922), in particular the reading *quisquis* or *quisque* for *quicquid* in *Avonia* 38.

**Athenaeum (Pavia).** I. 4. 1923.

A. Vogliano reproduces a new inscription found in Thessaly, and published by Comparetti in *Atene e Roma*. The sixteen lines are carved on marble. Comparetti restores a few syllables missing at the end of some lines, and conjectures that the original was a letter from an Egyptian oracle belonging to the Serapis and Isis cult in Thessaly, and was written on papyrus. This papyrus having got worn down by time was then by reverent disciples cut into marble exactly as it was with all its lacunae. V. rejects this theory, and gives his own emended reading, basing it on hexameter lines. He sees in it a hymn to Isis, and (in the first few lines) a glorification of her gifts. The later lines are full of difficulties. C. Pascal revises after an interval of many years his own version and explanation of the Oscan *deuotio* generally known as the curse of Vibia, containing imprecations against Paquius Cluatus and all his family. The curses, P. holds, are to be carried out by the hands of Vibia Aquia, probably a priestess of Ceres. The much discussed words *Valaimas puklum*, rendered variously as 'Optimae (i.e. Proserpinae) purgamentum,' or as 'optimae puerorum'

(i.e., *Εὐμενίδες*), or (following a variant reading *ualaimais puklum*) 'ualentissimis puerorum,' i.e. Dis Manibus, are rendered by P. as 'Valemae filium,' (1) because the formula 'ualaimas puklu' always follows the name of Paquius Cluatus, (2) the ritual mention of the mother of the person cursed is well attested, and (3) the form *Valaimas* may be akin to Valens, Valesius, etc. Buck and Skutsch have accepted this explanation. He assigns it to the first century B.C.

## II. 1. 1924.

Professor A. Donati has published excerpts from critical notes by Leopardi, published in the *Rheinisches Museum* of 1835, and therefore not accessible to present-day scholars. These notes contain a description of a Greek codex in the Bibliotheca Barberini, and conjectures in the texts of Libanius, Ant. Carystius, Apollo Dyscolus, Dio Cassius and others, also in the text of some Greek papyri. In the *Rhein. Museum* de Sinner, a friend of Leopardi, introduced the extracts with a promise of other valuable notes on Plato, Dionysius Halicarnassus, and other writers, but for reasons unknown found himself unable to publish them, though even after the death of Leopardi he was vainly searching for an opportunity.

P. Fraccaro surmises that the territories of the *tribus Veturia* extended to the south-west of Rome towards Ostia, and cites in support a fragment from a speech by Cato, *contra Veturium* (Priscian VI. p. 208, 2H) 'aquam Anienem in sacrum inferre oportebat, non minus XV milia Anien abest.' But the actual distance of the Anio from Rome precludes the tribal sacrum having been held there, and we know that other tribes held their sacra away from Rome in fixed and traditional localities. The Veturii, observing the common ritual of using water from specified rivers and sources, may have clung to their ancient and ritual use of Anio-waters even after they had migrated further south towards the Campagna and Ostia. This supposition fits in with the assertion that the Veturii were of Sabine origin and with the legend of a Sabine conquest of Rome and Latium.

A. Mancini publishes fragments from a MS. of Aelian's *Varia Historia* in the Library of Casa Mordini in Barga. The fragments are not arranged in order, 5 and 7 belonging clearly to the same page. Collating them with Hercher's edition and Apparatus Criticus, M. groups the readings into those worth noting in the MS. itself, others already given in the text as emended by Hercher, and others due to some (mostly unimportant) errors or peculiarities in the writing.

## Classical Philology. XVIII. 3. July, 1923.

R. J. Bonner, *The Commercial Policy of Imperial Athens*. While Athens protected the Greek communities by her measures to suppress piracy, she also used her sea power to apply coercive measures which were intended to centralize the trade of the Aegean in the city. The financing of commerce was so regulated as to benefit Athens, and commercial treaties were struck with the same object. R. M. Jones, *Posidonius and Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, i. 17-81. An analysis of Cicero's work makes it very doubtful whether Posidonius can be regarded as his source. The arguments in defence of immortality are the commonplaces of various schools. The geographical theory of Section 45 is opposed to that of Posidonius. The admission of obscurity with regard to the nature and the seat of the soul in the body is inappropriate to a Stoic. The reply to the arguments of Panaetius cannot be from Posidonius. B. E. Perry, *The Significance of the Title in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. The title is intended not in a concrete sense as referring to different stories of change, but, like Ibsen's 'Ghosts,' in a generic sense implying some reflections upon and illustrations of the general subject. The work, a humorous and ironical treatment,

represents a  
and Ovid : A  
made to the s  
view that bot  
Ovid he gives  
of the *Ciris* in  
dix. Under  
into connexion  
note on the te

## XVIII. 4

E. S. M.

Synesis. M.  
contrasts the  
E. K. Rand,  
*Biographia Li*  
the Appendix  
Diuinatione.  
*De Diuinatione*  
published bet  
Fato, Cicero's  
from March  
pleted the *De*  
worked up fr  
*A Graeco-Egy*  
papyrus No. 6  
It proves that  
documents of  
A.D. also prev  
*The Ciris* and  
and the Appen  
*Ciris*. Under  
Dr. Dörfeld  
of Meister's *L*  
explanation o  
Pliny ; J. W  
meaning, 'a  
37 C ; P. Sho  
the convention  
Plato respecti

## Hermes.

G. Wiss

new fragment  
*des griechischen*  
merce that th  
the modern  
*φορτηγία, παλ*  
Suppl. 4, 25,  
K. Latte, *Et*  
*Kallimachos von*

represents a radical departure from literary tradition. R. F. Thomason, *The Ciris and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poem*. T. reviews the main contributions made to the study of the language and authorship of the *Ciris*, and in support of the view that both the Tibullan and Virgilian Appendices contain the youthful works of Ovid he gives the first instalment of the results of a detailed study of the vocabulary of the *Ciris* in relation to Ovid, Virgil, Lucretius, Catullus, and the Tibullan Appendix. Under 'Notes and Discussions' W. G. Hardy brings Ovid *Am.* ii. 19 and iii. 4 into connexion with Philodemus' epigram, *A.P.* xii. 173, and P. Shorey contributes a note on the text of Plutarch, *De Communibus Notitiis*, 1059.

#### XVIII. 4. October, 1923.

E. S. McCartney, *Psychological v. Logical in Latin Syntax: Some Aspects of Synesis*. M. collects and classifies examples of sense-constructions in Latin, and contrasts the flexibility of Latin with the logical rigidity of English or German. E. K. Rand, *A Romantic Biography of Virgil*. An appreciation of De Witt's *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria*, with particular reference to the problem of the authorship of the *Appendix Vergiliana*. W. A. Falconer, *A Review of M. Durand's La Date du De Divinatione*. F. disputes Durand's view, set out in *Mélanges Boissier* (1903), that the *De Divinatione* was composed in January-February, 44 B.C., and hurriedly revised and published between March 15 and April 6. Durand's views as to the date of the *De Fato*, Cicero's state of mind between April 7 and May 1, and his political activities from March 15 to April 7 are criticized. F. suggests that Cicero had partly completed the *De Divinatione* (probably as far as i. 119) before the Ides; the rest was worked up from time to time, and the whole was never revised. F. E. Robbins, *A Graeco-Egyptian Mathematical Papyrus*. A description, together with the text, of papyrus No. 621 in the recently acquired collection of the University of Michigan. It proves that the conception and treatment of fractions which appear in Egyptian documents of the second millennium and again in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. also prevailed among the Greek population of Roman Egypt. R. F. Thomason, *The Ciris and Ovid. II*. T. deals with the relative frequency of colour-terms in Virgil and the Appendix, and continues his comparison of the vocabularies of Ovid and the *Ciris*. Under 'Notes and Discussions' publicity is given to a movement to honour Dr. Dörpfeld; A. Shewan criticizes Professor Bolling's linguistic tests in his review of Meister's *Die homerische Kunstsprache* in the previous number; E. K. Rand offers an explanation of the presence of *agere* in some copies of the first edition of the Aldine Pliny; J. Whatmough connects *uitulatis* with a diminutive of *uītis* in its original meaning, 'a pliant twig'; M. E. Hirst adds to a previous note on Plato, *Timaeus* 37 C; P. Shorey holds that Professors Norwood and Wilamowitz, in disregarding the conventions of stichomythia, have given to certain expressions in Euripides and Plato respectively a greater significance than they possess.

#### Hermes. LVIII. 4. 1923.

G. Wissowa, *Neue Bruchstücke de römischen Festkalenders*. An examination of new fragments from Ostia, Praeneste and Antium. J. Hasebroek, *Die Betriebsformen des griechischen Handels im IV. Jahrhundert*. It was of the essence of Greek sea commerce that the merchant accompanied his goods. There was no transport service in the modern sense. Valuable discussion of the meaning of ναύκληρος, ἔμπορος, φορηγία, παλιγκάπηλος. E. Bickel, *Protogamia*. An examination of CIL. viii. Suppl. 4, 25,045 (1916) with reference to Montanism and Donatism in Africa. K. Latte, *Eine Doppelfassung in den Sophisten-Biographien des Eunapios*. A. Stein, *Kallimachos von Petrai*. This Syrian sophist addressed one of his works to Virius

Lupus the consul ordinarius of 278 and another to Zenobia who probably assumed the name of Cleopatra during her short domination of Egypt. MISCELLAN: F. Jacoby on Anaximenes history of Alexander. E. Orth would read in Bacchylides XVIII. 16 δόμον ἡλθεν. Wackernagel suggests *Aemilius Aemilia* for the meaningless *Ennuus Enna* in Varro L.L. 9. 55, *Theoplactum* for *Theoractum* in Cic. Verr. IV. 148. *Elatreus* (cf. Hom. Od. θ. 111, 129) for *Latreus* in Ovid. Met. 12, 458. He also defends the spelling Μεγάβυξος for Μεγάβυξος and discusses other Iranian names.

#### Mnemosyne. L. 4. 1922.

P. H. Damsté continues his notes on Livy XLIII.-XLV; J. C. Naber his *Observationum de Iure Romano*. I. Errandonea, *Sophoclei Chori Persona Tragica*, examines the dictum of Aristotle that the chorus in Sophocles is one of the actors. In the *Oed. Tyr.* the chorus in the first half of the play strongly supports Oedipus, but in the ode 865-910 (as commonly interpreted) turns against him. E. thinks that the chorus, when uttering ὕβρις φητεύει τύραννον etc., believes that Laius was slain by his own son, but does not know that this son is Oedipus; and that the ὕβρις refers to Laius himself, who had ravished Chrysippus son of Pelops. In the *Oed. Col.* E. finds the clue in the patriotic devotion of the chorus to Athenian interests. It stands by Oedipus because his death and burial in Attica will bring blessings on the land. Believing that Polynices is about to offer Oedipus life in Thebes, they urge him rather to choose death in Attica. P. H. Damsté writes notes on *Avienus*, *Ora Maritima*, with special reference to Schulzen's edition (Berlin, 1922). W. Vollgraff derives σχινοῦρις from σχίνος and ὄρος, not (as Pauly-Wissowa) from σχίνος and οὐρα. Writing again *De Callimachi Ep.* XXI., he reads ὄστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεται πῶδα Βαρτιάδην με | ἴσθι Κυρηναίων. παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην εἰδείης ἄμφω κεν κ.τ.λ. Both father and son can claim the patronymic. C. Brakman, *De Ciri* maintains that the *Ciris* was written between the years 44 and 42 B.C., probably by Gallus. The lines *quacunque illa leuam . . . and cara Iouis suboles . . .* are more naturally in place in the *Ciris* than in the first *Georgic* and fourth *Eclogue* respectively. In the frequent spondaic lines the *Ciris* resembles Catullus rather than Virgil. J. S. Phillimore offers emendations on Terence *Hautont.* 289, *Eun.* 400, 670, 836, 847, *Ad.* 745.

#### LI. 1. 1923.

F. C. Unger, *Liber Hippocraticus περὶ καρδίας*, gives a full account of the MSS., editions and commentaries, followed by the text of the Vatican MS. and that constituted by himself; and finally a translation and commentary. J. J. Hartmann, in a Latin version of a paper by the late C. Kuiper, discusses the *Supplices* of Euripides. Metrical evidence suggests that the play was composed shortly after the *Hippolytus*, and there are almost certainly references to events between 424 and 421 B.C., which K. discusses in detail. Thus the reluctance of Theseus to undertake the cause of the Argives was suggested by the consciousness that the occupation of the temple of Apollo by the Athenians was a violation of religion. The pathetic appeal of Aethra contains a reference to Troezen, and may be regarded as a plea by the poet for an alliance with Troezen as well as with Argos. Finally K. draws attention to the contrast between the character of Capaneus as depicted in the *Supplices* and the account given of him in Aeschylus. Capaneus was worshipped at Eleusis as a hero, representing an original Ζεὺς καπνώτης, i.e., θεὸς χθόνιος. He was afterwards identified with the hero who was struck by lightning when climbing the walls of Thebes.

#### LI. 2. 1923.

C. Brakman contributes critical notes on Plautus *Menaechmi* and *Mercator*; P. H. Damsté on the *Siluae* of Statius. I. Errandonea, *Sophoclei Chori Persona*

*Tragica* (cont.  
stasimon (94  
Danae, Lycu  
E. thinks, no  
the maiden,  
the attitude o  
believes that  
Antigone (vv  
tyrant, its vi  
himself (v.  
MSS. read '  
arduous, comp  
C. Brakman,  
The treatme  
Lucretian.  
vides a new  
Tertullianus,  
to the *Apolo  
Hecataei Aba  
been suspect  
from a cont  
really lie aga  
the interpret*

#### LI. 3.

W. Vol

Pausanias II  
the daughter  
that A. wrot  
Sparta. Th  
Diodorus' d  
C. Iulio Pris  
with others)  
Gordian, the  
or is wrong  
*Persona Trag  
Electra. He  
Aegisthus;  
themis has r  
her to act al  
in it when a  
ings near th  
century but  
they were of  
on Hor. *Ep.  
aduertit* etc.  
Sophompan  
hoping to b  
to emend Th  
Philemon fr*

#### LI. 4.

W. Vol  
Cicero's *Ad*

*Tragica* (continued) next examines the choric passages of the *Antigone*. The fourth stasimon (944-987) has given rise to much discussion. How are the punishments of Danae, Lycurgus, Cleopatra relevant to the case of Antigone? They are introduced, E. thinks, not to console Antigone, but to foreshadow the catastrophes of the play, the maiden, the man, the matron representing Antigone, Haemon, Eurydice. As to the attitude of the chorus generally, it is consistent in standing by Creon so long as it believes that he has the law on his side; hence its somewhat cold sympathy with Antigone (vv. 800-805). Convinced by Haemon that Creon is playing the part of a tyrant, its view is confirmed by the words of Teiresias and the confession of Creon himself (v. 1112). P. H. Damsté proposes to emend Virg. *Aen.* VII. 624. The MSS. read 'pars arduus altis | puluerulentus equis furit.' D. would read *arcibus* for *arduus*, comparing for the construction v. 451, 'it clamor caelo,' with Gossrau's note. C. Brakman, *De Aetna Carmine*, collects internal evidence for a date about 30 B.C. The treatment of the subject is based on Posidonius, the style and metre are Lucretian. I. Kampstra, *De Rescripto Impp. Seueri et Caracallae Soluae reperto*, provides a new restoration of this inscription. J. van Wageningen, *Minucius Felix et Tertullianus*, collects passages of Minucius which can only be understood by reference to the *Apologeticon* of T., which must therefore be prior in date. M. Engers, *De Hecataei Aderitae Fragmentis*, observes that the fragments found in Josephus have been suspected as being philo-Judaic and containing statements which could not come from a contemporary of Alexander the Great. D. points out that the objections really lie against J.'s use of the fragments. A. G. Roos, *Πόλεμος Λαοδικεῖος*, discusses the interpretation of two papyri (Flinders Petrie Pap. ii. 45, and iii. 144).

### LI. 3. 1923.

W. Vollgraf, *De Aetate Acusilai Argini*, points out that Acusilaus (according to Pausanias II. 16. 24) ascribes the origin of Mycenae not, as Homer and Hesiod, to the daughter of the Argive Inachus, but to Sparton and Sparta. Hence he concludes that A. wrote at a time when Mycenae was hostile to Argos and in alliance with Sparta. The war led to the destruction of Mycenae in 468 B.C. (if we accept Diodorus' date). Hence A. belongs to the fifth century B.C. A. G. Roos, *De C. Iulio Prisco*, discusses an inscription found at Palmyra, which (read in connexion with others) suggests that there were two Prisci, one praetorian prefect under Gordian, the other under Philip. He suggests that the date has been wrongly read, or is wrongly given on the stone. I. Errandonea, continuing his *Sophoclei Chori Persona Tragica*, attempts a reinterpretation of the part played by the chorus in the *Electra*. He suggests that the chorus takes the initiative in urging vengeance upon Aegisthus; therefore it begs Electra to suppress her lamentations, and when Chrysothemis has refused her assistance and Orestes' death is reported, it tries to persuade her to act alone. It does not contemplate the slaying of Clytemnestra, but acquiesces in it when accomplished. A. G. Roos, *Brittenburg*, considers whether certain buildings near the place now so called, the ruins of which were sketched in the sixteenth century but have now disappeared, were part of a Roman fort, and concludes that they were of the form employed for such in the days of Constantine. J. S. Phillimore on Hor. *Ep.* XIX. 28 thinks that *musam temperat* is a composite phrase like *animum aduertit* etc., *tempero* meaning 'guide' 'control.' C. van Vollenhaven, *De Grotii Sophompanea*, thinks that G. wrote this sacred tragedy in 1633 A.D., when he was hoping to become reconciled to the Dutch Government. P. Groeneboom proposes to emend Theoph. XV. 6 by reading for τῷ ὄσαντι the words τῷ ἀρδαλώσαντι. Cf. Philemon fr. 59.

### LI. 4. 1923.

W. Vollgraf writes annotations, chiefly critical, on Soph. *Oed. Tyr.*, Brakman on Cicero's *Academica* and *Somnium Scipionis*, P. Corssen on Tertullian *Adu. Marcionem*,

Lib. IV., A. G. Roos on certain Greek papyri in the Giessen Museum, B. A. van Groningen on Ryland's Papyrus LXXVII. I. H. Thiel, *De Dinone Colophonio Nepotis in Vita Datamis Auctore*, attempts to establish that Dinon was the source employed by Nepos. Trogius derived from Dinon his material, not only in Bks. I. and II. (as Gutschmid proved), but also in Bks. III.-X., as appears from a comparison of Nepos *Con.* III. 2 sqq. (which N. admits to be due to Dinon) with Iust. VI. 2. 12 sqq. But Plutarch *Art.* XXVI. and Trogius (Iust. X. 2. 1) have fallen into a common error in reference to the cause of Darius' conspiracy against Artaxerxes. Therefore this part of Plutarch *Art.* is due to Dinon. A comparison of Plutarch *Art.* XXIX. (ad init.) with Nepos *Dat.* IX. reveals an almost verbal similarity. Therefore Nepos *Dat.* is derived also from Dinon. A. G. Roos, *De C. Iul. Prisco Addendum*, has been informed by J. B. Chabot that (i.) Priscus' name, though erased, is still discernible in the Palmyrene inscription; (ii.) that the date there given is 554 (= 242-3 A.D.). Thus the conclusions arrived at by R. are confirmed.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc.** LIII./LIV. 1. 1924.

B. Stenzel-Mugdan, *Philosophische Motive im Weltbild des Aristoteles*. A careful exposition of the fundamental ideas of the *De caelo*, emphasizing the change produced by modern astronomy in our attitude to the same problems. W. Ensslin, *Die Acker-gesetzgebung seit Ti. Gracchus im Kampfe der politischen Parteien*. A short account of land legislation from Tiberius Gracchus to the end of the Republic. L. von Sybel, *Probleme der christlichen Antike*. Deals chiefly with the position of art in early Christianity, and especially with the symbolism of the catacomb paintings. The importance in this connexion of the interior decoration of early basilicas is emphasized. Von Sybel champions Rome against the East. J. Overbeck, *Die Entdeckung des Kindes im I. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* Shows by quotation from literary and medical writers how intelligent was the interest taken at this time in children and their education: and lays stress upon the influence of Stoicism.

**Philological Quarterly (Iowa) II. 4. 1923.**

A. S. Cook, *Hadrian of England*. Discusses, among other questions, the condition of culture in Roman Africa in the seventh century. F. A. Wood, *Greek and Latin Etymologies*. Deals with the etymology of thirty-two Greek and Latin words, including ἀνθρωπος, πάσχω, στέργω, idoneus.

**III. 1. 1924.**

W. A. Oldfather, *Locris and early Greek civilization*. The contribution of the Locrian clan, in Greece and Italy, to Homeric epic, Lesbian lyric, heroic dithyramb, choral lyric and to legislation.

**Philologus. LXXIX. 1. 1923.**

M. Birt, *Beiträge zum Verständniss der Oden des Horaz*. Discusses at length Odes I. 1, 2, 8, 12, 32. Following emendations proposed, viz. 1, 4 meta ubi feruidis; 2, 21 audiet ciues satiasse ferrum; 12, 11 sqq. blandum et auritas fidibus canoris | ducere dorcas; 32, 15 mihi iuncta salve. Punctuation of the vulgate altered in three passages: read viz. 2, 41-4 Siue mutata iuuenem figura | Ales in terris imitatis, almae | Filius Maiae patiens uocari, | Caesaris ultor; 8, 13 sqq. Quid? latet ut marinae . . .; 12, 21 sqq. . . honores. | Proeliis audax, neque te silebo, Liber. . . N. Wecklein, *Die Antiope des Euripides*. Reconstructs the play and gives revision of fragments contained in papyrus published by Mahaffy (*Cunningham Memoirs*, VIII. 1891). E. Bornemann, *Aristoteles' Urteil über Platons politische Theorie*, I. Reviews previous literature and claims that relevant passages of the

Politics have  
of Politics 126  
pages of note  
reads for μετὰ

**LXXIX.**

E. Bornemann  
A's criticism  
P's thought.  
and collation  
in possession  
2,000 verses  
passages its  
are generally  
seems correct  
fixing the text  
und Erklärung  
Oxyrhynchos I  
the hymn pu  
example of C  
music. H. M  
χελιδών, a fish  
Meleager leg  
αὐτόν τε καὶ

**LXXIX.**

E. Kappeler  
Σωκράτης ὁ  
mentioned in  
politische The  
Politics 1265  
consideration  
Plato's politi  
this speech,  
cusses (1) Th  
πῶς mention  
to fix these  
reads ito him  
lecturer. In  
thus mention  
convention.

**Supplem.**

Anton v  
Pp. 76. T  
(= a and b),  
(= P. Oxy. V  
and the Alex  
date 38 A.D.  
Aphrodisia,  
and writer li  
Cair. 10448)  
the process

*Politics* have not been scrutinized closely enough. This article contains translation of *Politics* 1260b 27-1264b 41; 1290b 38-1291a 33; 1315b 40-1316b 27, and eighteen pages of notes. K. Rupprecht, *Empedocles Fr.* 133. Comparing *Lucretius* 5, 100 sqq. reads for *μεγίστη* (sc. ἀμαξίτος) ἐλαχίστη (= *proxima* in *Lucretius*).

## LXXIX. 2. 1923.

E. Bornemann, *Aristoteles' Urteil über Platons politische Theorie*, II. Examines A's criticisms, and concludes that they show no serious attempt to appreciate P's thought. H. Magnus, *Neue Bruchstücke einer Ovidhandschrift*. Gives description and collation of unpublished MS. (called *ρ* by the writer) of the *Metamorphoses*, now in possession of Herr Uelner at Cologne. MS. is badly mutilated, but contains about 2,000 verses from Bks. 1-8; date twelfth to thirteenth century. In several passages its readings agree with those of the later MSS. which, though acceptable, are generally regarded as conjectures; in a few places it alone gives a reading which seems correct, e.g. 2, 653; 3, 208; 5, 624; 7, 42; 8, 107. '*ρ* is valuable aid towards fixing the text and deserves a place in the *App. Crit.*' K. Prinz, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Achilleis des Statius*. Twelve passages discussed. R. Wagner, *Der Oxyrhynchos Notensapyrus*. Comments on text, notation, etc., and aesthetic value of the hymn published as No. 1786 in *Oxyrh. Pap.* XV. 1922. The hymn is our oldest example of Christian Church music and important as showing connexion with pagan music. H. Lehmann. In *Petronius* 35, 9 for *oclopeta* read *ocypeta* or *ocipeta* = ὠκυπέτεια χελιδών, a fish—perhaps the *dactylopterus uolitans*. W. Anderson. Cites parallels to Meleager legend from *Lettish Saga*. W. Ensslin. In *Appian*, B.C. 1, 94, 434, read αὐτόν τε καὶ Νωρβανόν for αὐτόν τε Νωρβανόν.

## LXXIX. 3. 1923.

E. Kapp, *Sokrates der Jüngere*. Discusses the connexion between Aristotle and Σωκράτης ὁ νεώτερος referred to in the *Vitae*, and the doctrine of this Socrates mentioned in *Metaphysics* 1036b 24. E. Bornemann, *Aristoteles' Urteil über Platons politische Theorie* III. Contains (1) A's criticism of the *Laws*, viz. translation of *Politics* 1265a 1-1266a 30, with notes and discussion of general points (2) Some considerations on A's character and circumstances as unfitting him to criticize Plato's political speculations. H. Bogner, *Kaiser Julians 5. Rede*. Detailed analysis of this speech, which deals with the Attis-legend. D. Viedebant, *Metrologica*. Discusses (1) The Corinthian standard of coinage. (2) The βασιλῆος πῆχυν and μέτριος πῆχυν mentioned in *Herodotus* 1, 178. Babylonian bricks and other data enable us to fix these with fair exactitude. W. Schmid, *Vergilius Catalepton* 5, 7. In 5, 5 reads *ito hinc, inane, i, cymbalon iuuentutis*; the latter phrase denotes an unnamed lecturer. In 7, 2 read *Pothus* as proper name; the offence against the *praecepta* lay in thus mentioning the ἐρώμενος by his real name—comp. *Apuleius, Apol.* 10, for the convention. Schwierczina, *Coniectanea in Frontonem*. Discusses fifteen passages.

## Supplementband XVI., Heft 2. 1923.

Anton von Premerstein, *Zu den sogenannten Alexandrinischen Märtyrerakten*. Pp. 76. The author reviews all the texts discovered up to date, viz. A, B (= a and b), C, D, O, P, and P. Fay. 217, and discusses in detail O, A, and C. In O (= P. Oxy. VIII. 1089) there is described an interview between the Prefect Flaccus and the Alexandrians Isidorus and Dionysius: the scene is the temple of Serapis, the date 38 A.D. Dionysius desires a passport for Rome and offers the Prefect a woman, Aphrodisia, as a bribe. The persons described are historic, but details are imaginary and writer lived considerable time after alleged interview. A (= BGU. II. 511 + P. Cair. 10448) describes appearance of Isidorus and others before Claudius. Date of the process is A.D. 53, place probably the *horti Statiliani*. *Tarquitiu Priscus* was

member of Claudius' *consilium*. The 'Jewess Salome' is accused of prejudicing Claudius against the Alexandrians. (N.B. von Premerstein's supplements in the text seem extremely doubtful.) C. (= P. Oxy. I. 33) narrates the protest of the Gymnasiarch Appian against his condemnation by Commodus. Appian claims to be tried as an *honestior*; the affair seems to be a sideshow to some larger trial involving senators, and the Heliodorus mentioned is possibly a son of Avidius Cassius.

Generally speaking the texts, while often based on real happenings, exhibit imaginary setting and dramatic treatment. They are *not* based on official reports of the trials, though the information given in Ba must come from eye-witnesses. Except for Ba they probably formed part of an anti-Caesar pamphlet and were perhaps put together about the time of the rising under Caracalla. In view of their purpose and tone the title 'Märtyrerakten' is unsuitable.

XVII. Heft 1. 1923.

J. Röhr, *Der okkulte Kraftbegriff im Altertum*. Pp. 133. A full account with references and citations of the terms used to express magical powers and properties among the Greeks and Romans. Chap. 1 deals with such terms as *δύναμις*, *ἐνέργεια*, *πρᾶξις*, *uis*, *virtus*, *potentia*, etc. Chap. 2 with 'sympathy' and 'antipathy.' Chap. 3 with more special terms for magic power. Chap. 4 with *ιδιότητες ἄρρητοι* and influences *καθ' ὅλην τὴν οὐσίαν*.

Revue de Philologie. XLVI. 3. 1922.

Revue des comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique, 1919-1920.

XLVI. 4. 1922.

Contains an analytical bibliography of articles published in classical journals during 1921.

XLVII. 1. 1923.

A. Mansion, *Le texte de la Physique d'Aristote (I.-IV.)*. H. de la Ville de Mirmont, in Cic. *Verr.* III. 37, 85 would read *Itaque qui tot annis agellos suos redimere a piratis solebant, idem se ipsos te praetore a te pretio imposito redemerunt*. A. Guillemin, *Quelques corrections au texte de Cornelius Nepos*. M. Niedermann, *Notes critiques sur quelques textes médicaux Latins*. G. Mathieu, *Deux MSS. méconnus de la Rhétorique à Alexandre*. The preface to the treatise is found in Toletanus 101. 14, fol. 81, sixteenth century and in Bergomensis, Δ, vi. 29, fol. 169 fifteenth century. J. Marouzeau, *Sur la qualité des mots*. A study of the groups *homines, mortales: filius, liberi-natus, nati*. L. Havet, *Notes critiques sur Eschyle*.

XLVII. 2. 1923.

A. Diès, *L'échelle finale des biens dans le Philèbe*. A discussion of the crux in 66a 4. Diès finds a marginal variant *ἡδίων* in W, and would read *τινὰ ἡδίων ἡρῶσθαι*. L. Havet, *Notes critiques sur Eschyle*. W. Deonna, *Aristophane et l'Athènes d'Avenches*. The comic description of the goddess in *Eq.* 1090-1096 is suggested by some work of art similar to the bronze statuette of Athena found at Avenches in 1916. A. Boulanger, *Lucien et Aelius Aristide*. Argues that Lucian in his satires on the philosophers was influenced by Aristides. E. Ernout, *Tempore puncto*. Attacking Diels' view that this is a vulgarism and is a genitive *tempori(s) puncto*. It is equivalent to *temporis puncto* where *puncto* is a substantive and means 'in time reduced to a point' (cf. *C.Q.* XVIII., p. 42).

judicing  
s in the  
t of the  
aims to  
nvolving

exhibit  
reports  
itnesses.  
nd were  
view of

unt with  
roperties  
ἐνέργεια,  
Chap. 3  
ητοι and

9-1920.

journals

Ville de  
*redimere*  
uillemin,  
*iques sur*  
étorique  
fol. 81,  
Marou-  
*, liberi—*

crux in  
ὑποῖσθαι.  
*Avenches.*  
work of  
Boulan-  
osophers  
view that  
*temporis*  
(cf. C.Q.